

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

OCT 20 2017

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk

By Jan Josef Manrique Deputy
Jan Josef Manrique

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Coordinated Proceeding
Special Title (Rule 3.550)

Johnson & Johnson Talcum Powder Cases

Charmaine Lloyd, et al. v. Johnson & Johnson,
et al., BC628228

Plaintiff Eva Echeverria

Case No. BC628228
JCCP No. 4872

ORDERS REGARDING
DEFENDANTS JOHNSON & JOHNSON
CONSUMER, INC. AND JOHNSON &
JOHNSON'S COMBINED MOTION FOR
NEW TRIAL, DEFENDANT JOHNSON &
JOHNSON CONSUMER, INC.'S MOTION
FOR JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING
THE VERDICT, AND DEFENDANT
JOHNSON & JOHNSON'S MOTION
FOR JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING
THE VERDICT

Hearing Date: October 12, 2017
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Dept.: 307

1 **I. BACKGROUND**

2 **A. Brief Overview of the Case**

3 This case involves the first trial of claims by plaintiffs in coordinated proceedings
4 contending they developed ovarian cancer as a result of their use of defendants’ products
5 (Johnson’s Baby Powder and Shower to Shower)¹ in their perineal area. The products contain
6 talc.

7 Plaintiff Eva Echeverria² (“Echeverria”) testified that she began using Johnson’s Baby
8 Powder when she began menstruation in approximately 1965 at age 11 and used the product on a
9 daily basis, and more frequently when menstruating, until 2016. She used Shower to Shower
10 less frequently. She was diagnosed with high grade serous ovarian cancer in 2007. The action
11 was filed July 26, 2016. An expedited trial was ordered given her medical situation and
12 commenced July 21, 2017.

13 Prior to trial summary judgment was granted as to defendant Imerys Talc America, Inc.
14 (“Imerys”), who supplied the raw talc for the products. The case went to trial against defendants
15 Johnson & Johnson and JJCI. It was tried on a theory of negligent failure to warn.

16 The evidence showed that Johnson’s Baby Powder was first sold in 1893. The evidence
17 focused largely on epidemiological studies that show a statistical correlation between talc usage
18

19 ¹ The evidence at trial was that Johnson & Johnson manufactured talcum powder until 1967.
20 Thereafter, the product, as well as Shower to Shower, was manufactured by Johnson & Johnson
21 Consumer Inc. (“JJCI”). For purposes of this Order the defendants are referred to jointly except
22 when separate reference is needed.

23 ² Eva Echeverria died September 20, 2017. Her daughter, Elisha Echeverria, Acting Trustee of
24 The 2017 Eva Elaine Echeverria Living Trust, was substituted as plaintiff on October 12, 2017.
25 For ease of reading reference to “plaintiff” is to Eva Echeverria. No disrespect is intended.

1 and ovarian cancer. The first study mentioning talc and cancer apparently was published in 1971
2 (Henderson, et. al.) but the study was not admitted into evidence. The only reference to it in the
3 record is a citation to it in another study (Boorman 1994) (Ex. L-97) wherein Boorman reported
4 that there was “some concern reported about the perineal exposure to talc and the occurrence of
5 ovarian cancer in women...although other studies have failed to find such an association” and
6 cited to Henderson. (Tr. 1271:25-1272:14.) The reports in evidence were to the effect that since
7 at least 1982 there has been an ongoing debate in the scientific community as to whether talc
8 usage may cause ovarian cancer or whether the science supported only a finding that there was a
9 statistical association between talc use and cancer. The jury was called upon to resolve this
10 complex scientific question.

11 12 **B. A Brief Summary of the Law, the Evidence, and the Verdict**

13 In an action alleging that a product causes cancer, giving rise to a duty to warn,
14 causation must be proven with a reasonable medical probability based upon competent expert
15 testimony. Mere possibility alone is insufficient to establish a prima facie case.

16
17 A possible cause only becomes ‘probable’ when, in the absence of other
18 reasonable causal explanations, it becomes more likely than not that the injury
19 was a result of its action. This is the outer limit of inference upon which an issue
20 may be submitted to the jury. (See *Parker v. Employers Mutual Liability Ins. Co.*
21 *of Wis.* (Tex. 1969) 440 S.W.2d 43, 47.)... With cancer the question of causation
22 is especially troublesome.... Under the present state of scientific knowledge... it is
23 frequently difficult to determine the nature and cause of a particular cancerous
24 growth.... Although juries are normally permitted to decide issues of causation
25 without guidance from experts, ‘the unknown and mysterious etiology of cancer’
is beyond the experience of laymen and can only be explained through expert
testimony. (*Parker v. Employers Mutual Liability Ins. Co. of Wis.*, *supra*, at p.

1 46.) Such testimony, however, can enable a plaintiff's action to go to the jury only
2 if it establishes a reasonably probable causal connection between an act and a
3 present injury.

4 *Jones v. Ortho Pharm. Corp.* (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 396, 403-404.

5 As discussed in further detail below, Echeverria's expert witnesses testified as to various
6 epidemiological studies, as well as studies on animals, and opined as to general causation. Laura
7 Plunkett, Ph.D. ("Plunkett") testified that in her opinion perineal use of talc can cause ovarian
8 cancer. She characterized talc as a toxin that causes changes in cell formation that become
9 cancerous over time and extended use, relying on studies that showed talc initiates an
10 inflammatory response in cells, leading to the production of reactive oxygen species and changes
11 in gene expression. (Tr. 1048:22-1051:23; 1009:3-1009:6; 1622:9-27; 1623-1624:25.)

12 John Godleski, M.D. ("Godleski"), testified that evaluation by electron microscopy
13 showed talc was present in Echeverria's ovarian tissue.

14 Evidence was introduced that since at least 1982 (and possibly 1971 if the 1994
15 Boorman statements regarding Henderson's work are considered) several epidemiological
16 studies showed a statistically valid correlation between talc exposure and ovarian cancer. Jack
17 Siemiatycki, Ph.D. ("Siemiatycki") testified that in 2006 the International Agency for Research
18 on Cancer ("IARC"), a division of the World Health Organization, categorized talc as "possibly"
19 carcinogenic if used perineally. This term was defined to mean that "chance, bias, and
20 confounding" could not be excluded as explaining the epidemiological results. IARC declined to
21 find talc was a known or probable cause of ovarian cancer. (Ex. P-29; Tr. 1196: 7-23; 1198:8-
22 1200:2; 2162:18-2163:10; 2282:5-2283:28; 2285:23-26; 2291: 15-23.) Siemiatycki, who chaired
23 the IARC working group that classified talc as "possibly" carcinogenic, testified that in his view
24 the present epidemiology results, including a pooled study (Terry 2013) sufficiently show a
25 probable association between ovarian cancer and perineal talc use as that term is used by IARC
(TR 2173:11-2176:19; 2401:22-28; 2412:20-2413:17) but conceded that the epidemiology was

1 insufficient prior to 2007 to conclude that there was a causal association between perineal use of
2 talc and ovarian cancer. (Tr. 2300:15-19; 2362:11-22.) Siemiatycki authored a paper to the same
3 effect, published in 2008. (Ex. P-105; Tr. 2300:9-14.)

4 Numerous epidemiologic studies were put to the jury showing a range of “relative risk”
5 ratios. Siemiatycki explained that “relative risk” is the ratio of the risk among persons exposed
6 to the risk compared to the risk among the unexposed, explaining that “if the risk of cancer in the
7 general population... is 4 percent in the general population but among a group of people with a
8 certain environmental exposure it is 6 percent, the relative risk of cancer due to that
9 environmental exposure would be 6 percent divided by 4 percent equals 1.5.” (Tr. 2126:17-
10 2127:21.) He further explained that a ratio resulting in 2.0 is “the point at which the probability
11 of causation, which is the probability that a given agent causes a specific disease, exceeds 50
12 percent” (Tr. 2434: 15-27.)

13 Annie Yessaian M.D. (“Yessaian”), Echeverria’s treating physician, engaged in a
14 “differential etiology” analysis and opined that that it was more probable than not defendants’
15 products caused Echeverria’s illness.

16 Echeverria emphasized at trial that condom manufacturers ceased using talc on their
17 products in the 1990s. However, no admissible evidence was introduced suggesting that they did
18 so because of information suggesting that talc was linked to ovarian cancer and the jury was
19 instructed to disregard any such inference or suggestion.

20 Echeverria also introduced documents from defendants’ files referencing a “talc/ovary
21 problem” and documents that showed they engaged in efforts to persuade regulators and the
22 scientific community, including the National Toxicology Program (“NTP”) and IARC, that the
23 studies were insufficient to conclude that talc was a probable cause of ovarian cancer, including
24 evidence that Johnson & Johnson provided funding to a trade association known as the
25

1 Cosmetics, Toiletry, and Fragrance Trade Association (“CFTA”) and that it also took steps on its
2 own to advance the debate in its favor.

3 Defendants introduced evidence there was no peer reviewed literature suggesting any
4 causal mechanism (i.e. that extended use of talc caused inflammation leading to cancer). No
5 published peer-reviewed articles have determined talc to cause ovarian cancer. (Tr. 2276:21-
6 2277:19; 2280:2-10; 3695:19-3696:7; 3749:12-3750:1.) Further, defendants’ experts testified to
7 the effect that the epidemiology relied upon by Echeverria’s experts, with four exceptions,
8 discussed *infra*, showed a relative risk ratio of less than 2.0.

9 Defendants also showed that talc is not recognized as an ovarian cancer risk by the
10 Centers for Disease Control or medical associations such as the American Congress of Obstetrics
11 and Gynecologists or Society of Gynecological Oncology. (Tr. 2714:2-2721:9; 3580:9-3590:5.)
12 The federal Food and Drug Administration has been requested to require manufacturers of talc
13 powders to warn of a potential link to ovarian cancer but declined to do so. The most recent
14 Physician Data Query published by the National Cancer Institute concluded that “[t]he weight of
15 the evidence does not support an association between perineal talc exposure and an increased
16 risk of ovarian cancer.” (Tr. 1619:6-1620:8.) Although some manufacturers have recently placed
17 a warning on their product and Imerys advised of IARC’s 2006 findings on its Material Safety
18 Data Sheet (“MSDS”), the evidence showed most manufacturers’ products do not contain a
19 warning today. There was no evidence of any warning by a manufacturer prior to 2007.

20 Defendants moved for nonsuit and a directed verdict, which were denied.

21 The jury was instructed based on CACI 1222, 430 and 431, with additional special
22 instructions. Those instructions required Echeverria to show that each defendant manufactured
23 and sold Johnson’s Baby Power and Shower to Shower to Echeverria and that prior to 2007 the
24 products were dangerous or likely to be dangerous when used in a reasonably foreseeable
25 manner, giving rise to an obligation to warn. The jury was also given Special Instruction No. 1

1 that required Echeverria to show that exposure to talc was a substantial factor in causing her
2 illness by showing through expert testimony that there was a reasonable medical probability that
3 talc causes ovarian cancer and a reasonable medical probability that it was a substantial factor in
4 causing Echeverria's ovarian cancer. The jury was instructed under CACI 103 that liability as to
5 both actual and punitive damages was required to be shown as to each defendant separately. The
6 jury was also instructed under CACI 3945 as to the burden of proof on punitive damages.
7 Echeverria requested instructions on agency and alter ego liability. Those instructions were not
8 given.

9 After a three week trial, including extensive expert testimony, the jury found in favor of
10 Echeverria, awarding \$68,000,000 in non-economic damages from Johnson & Johnson and
11 \$2,000,000 in non-economic damages from JCCI. It assessed \$340,000,000 in punitive damages
12 against Johnson & Johnson and \$ 7,000,000 against JCCI.

13 Defendants move for new trial or for judgment notwithstanding the verdict ("JNOV").

14 **C. Summary of Rulings and Orders**

15
16 Mindful of the heavy burdens imposed on the moving parties, and the deference to be
17 given to the jury's verdict, for the reasons that follow the Court concludes that defendants' trial
18 motions should have been granted and now grants the defendants' motions for JNOV. It also
19 grants defendants a new trial on the grounds of (1) insufficiency of the evidence as to causation
20 as to both defendants (Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. 657(6)); (2) error in law occurring at trial and
21 excepted to by defendants (Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. 657(7)); (3) misconduct of the jury (Cal. Code
22
23
24
25

1 of Civ. Pro. 657(2)); and (4) excessive compensatory damages as to Johnson & Johnson and
2 excessive punitive damages as to both defendants (Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. 657(5)).³

3 **II. JOHNSON & JOHNSON’S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT**
4 **NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT**

5
6 **A. Procedural Requirements and Legal Standard for JNOV Motions**

7 A JNOV motion must be made within the time for filing and serving a notice of intention
8 to move for new trial, and if a motion for new trial has been made the court is to rule on both
9 motions at the same time. Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §629(b). Notice of this motion was timely filed
10 and the motion was argued concurrently with the new trial motion.

11 “The court . . . shall render judgment in favor of the aggrieved party notwithstanding the
12 verdict whenever a motion for a directed verdict for the aggrieved party should have been
13 granted had a previous motion been made.” Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §629(a). The power to grant
14 judgment notwithstanding the verdict is the same as the power to grant a nonsuit or directed
15 verdict, all of which are based on the legal sufficiency of the evidence. (*Beavers v. Allstate Ins.*
16 *Co.* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 310, 327-328.) A motion for JNOV is akin to a demurrer to the
17 evidence. Where a demurrer assumes all facts pleaded are true, a JNOV motion assumes all
18 evidence supporting the verdict is true; the issue to be determined is whether such evidence
19 constitutes a prima facie case. (*Moore v. San Francisco* (1970) 5 Cal.App.3d 728, 733.)

20 While evidence must be accepted as true and viewed in a light most favorable to the
21 verdict, it must be substantial. (*Sweatman v. Dept. of Veterans Affairs* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 62, 68;
22 *Osborn v. Irwin Memorial Blood Bank* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 234.) “‘Substantial evidence’ is not
23 synonymous with ‘any’ evidence. To constitute sufficient substantiality to support the verdict,

24 ³ The Court is also mindful that this case was prepared and tried in an expedited manner. Trial
25 counsel, as well as JCCP liaison counsel, were required to do an extraordinary amount of work
on behalf of their clients in a short period of time and are to be commended in this regard.

1 the evidence must be ‘reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value; it must actually be
2 ‘substantial’ proof of the essentials which the law requires in a particular case.’” (Id. at 284,
3 citing *Kruse v. Bank of America* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 38, 51.)

4 **B. The Parties’ Arguments**

5 Johnson & Johnson argues that JNOV must be granted as there was no evidence that it
6 manufactured Johnson’s Baby Powder or Shower to Shower. Further, it argues that if the
7 evidence could be inferred to show that prior to 1967 it manufactured Johnson’s Baby Powder
8 there is no evidence to show it knew or should have known in the period 1965-1967 that talcum
9 powder was linked in any way with ovarian cancer, as the first scientific work in this regard was
10 published in 1982. It argues that as a matter of law it had no on-going duty to warn and further
11 argues that it cannot be liable for the acts of its subsidiary absent a showing of agency or alter
12 ego liability and that no such evidence was adduced.

13 Echeverria contends that witness Lorena Telofski (“Telofski”), designated as the “person
14 most knowledgeable” by both defendants, as well as various experts and third parties, referred to
15 “Johnson and Johnson” in their testimony without distinguishing between the two entities. She
16 further contends that after 1967 Johnson & Johnson had knowledge that talc was the probable
17 cause of ovarian cancer and thus had an on-going duty to warn consumers, notwithstanding that
18 it did not manufacture the product because Johnson & Johnson “kept responsibility” over JCCI
19 and directed it to manufacture the products, thereby justifying the imposition of liability against
20 it.

21 **C. The Evidence As To Johnson & Johnson**

22
23
24 The uncontradicted evidence was that Echeverria used Johnson’s Baby Powder
25 beginning at age 11 (approximately 1965) and until 2016.

1 The evidence as to who manufactured the products at issue during that time period was
2 limited and consisted of (1) an interrogatory asking the defendants “to state the first and last
3 dates of sale of each product” it manufactured or sold that contained talc. The joint response
4 stated that Johnson’s Baby Powder “debuted” in 1893 and Shower to Shower debuted in the
5 1960s (Tr. 3111: 19-27); (2) an interrogatory stating JJCI is a wholly owned subsidiary of
6 Johnson & Johnson existing since 1967 (Tr. 3111:2-3112:10); (3) testimony through Telofski
7 that JJCI was responsible for the marketing and internal procedures and safety assessments of
8 both products (Tr. 811:8-14; 812:27-813:23; 852:18-853:1; 861:27-862:10; 863: 18-22); and (4)
9 demonstrative exhibits showing that the labeled packages show JJCI as the manufacturer of the
10 products. (Ex. P-49; P-50) .

11 The only document in evidence dated prior to 1967 was a 1964 memorandum. (P-343).
12 That document discussed the development of a potential consumer research test with respect to a
13 powder made with a cornstarch product called “Dry Flo.” The penultimate paragraph states that
14 a Johnson & Johnson employee (William Ashton) established that “the largest commercial uses
15 of Dry Flo are...as a condom lubricant where it replaced talc because it was found to be
16 absorbed safely in the vagina whereas, of course, talc was not.” No witness was called to explain
17 the meaning of this sentence, which is capable of two interpretations (whether talc was absorbed
18 in the vagina at all or whether, if absorbed, it was “safely” absorbed). Echeverria argues this
19 document is sufficient to show both that Johnson & Johnson manufactured the products at issue
20 prior to 1967 and had a duty to warn and that it acted with malice in not doing so, supporting the
21 verdict against it.

22 //

23 //

24 //

1 **D. Analysis**

2 **(1) Duty to Warn**

3
4 A duty to warn arises when a manufacturer fails to warn of facts that it knows or should
5 know make a product likely to be dangerous. (*Trejo v. Johnson & Johnson* (2017) 13 Cal. App.
6 5th 110, 131, citing *Valentine v Baxter Healthcare Corp.* (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1467, 1482.)
7 As to Johnson & Johnson before a duty to warn could be imposed Echeverria was required to
8 show that it manufactured the products at issue; that talc was the more likely than not cause of
9 her ovarian cancer; and that Johnson & Johnson knew or should have known that talc probably
10 would cause cancer. In this regard a manufacturer will not be “charged with knowing more than
11 what would come to light from the prevailing scientific or medical knowledge” at the time.
12 (*Valentine*, 68 Cal. App. 4th at 1483-1484. *See also Anderson v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas*
13 *Corp.* (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 987, 1002 [“Negligence law in a failure-to-warn case requires a plaintiff
14 to prove that a manufacturer or distributor did not warn of a particular risk for reasons which fell
15 below the acceptable standard of care, i.e., what a reasonably prudent manufacturer would have
16 known and warned about.”]; *Carlin v. Superior Court* (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 1104, 1112, (citing
17 *Anderson*) [“Stated another way, a reasonably prudent manufacturer might reasonably decide
18 that the risk of harm was such as not to require a warning as, for example, if the manufacturer's
19 own testing showed a result contrary to that of others in the scientific community. Such a
20 manufacturer might escape liability under negligence principles.”])

21 Echeverria alleged that Johnson & Johnson designed, developed, manufactured, tested,
22 packaged, promoted, marketed, advertised, distributed, labeled, and sold the products
23 (Echeverria First Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 14, 18, 20, 21, 85, 94, 131), made specific advertising
24 claims (Id. at ¶¶ 25, 26), have continuously advertised and marketed the products since the 1970s
25 (Id. at ¶31), and failed to warn (¶¶ 89, 90).

1 After initially referring to both Johnson & Johnson and JJCI in the pleading, for the most
2 part the two parties are jointly referred to as Johnson & Johnson. This is made clear in Paragraph
3 9 where, after introducing Defendant Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc. (now
4 known as Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc.) as a wholly owned subsidiary of Johnson &
5 Johnson, Echeverria indicates that the two companies will thereafter be referred to jointly as the
6 "Johnson & Johnson Defendants." Echeverria did not allege any theory for holding the parent
7 liable for the acts of the subsidiary (such as alter ego or agency), but instead alleges the same
8 wrongful acts as to both. However, Echeverria did not establish this at trial.

9 Echeverria failed to put on direct evidence as to who manufactured the products in the
10 period 1965-1967. The interrogatory response read into the record is ambiguous but taken
11 together with Exhibit P-343 and the testimony of Telofski the jury could infer that Johnson &
12 Johnson manufactured the product prior to 1967.

13 The sole evidence argued to impose a duty to warn on Johnson & Johnson that existed
14 prior to 1967 is Exhibit P-343, authored in 1964. Interpreting the disputed sentence in the light
15 most favorable to Echeverria, the document states only that talc was not "safely absorbed" in the
16 vagina but does not discuss in any way the alleged consequences of that fact, i.e. that it was a
17 probable cause of ovarian cancer. There was no showing that as of 1967 there was any
18 suggestion by the scientific or medical community that talc was associated with ovarian cancer.
19 And, no internal documents from the company prior to that date suggest that conclusion. Thus,
20 one cannot infer from the document that Johnson & Johnson knew or should have known prior to
21 1967 that talc more probably than not caused ovarian cancer, such that any duty to warn of that
22 fact arose at that time.

23 The further evidence at trial was that after 1967 JJCI manufactured the products at issue
24 and was responsible for assessing their safety and determining whether warning labels should be
25 put on them. At oral argument and in her briefing Echeverria conceded that the documents and

1 evidence showed that Johnson & Johnson ceased making Johnson's Baby Powder in 1967.
2 However, she argues that because Johnson & Johnson called no witness to show that Johnson &
3 Johnson's "involvement" with talc products ended in 1967 the jury could infer that Johnson &
4 Johnson was liable for failure to warn. (Echeverria's Opposition to Johnson & Johnson's motion
5 for JNOV at page 2, lines 24-25.)

6 This argument fails. Echeverria bore the burden of proof on this issue. She presented no
7 evidence to contradict Telofski's testimony or the demonstrative exhibits. The law is well-
8 established that a holding company ordinarily cannot be held liable for the acts of its wholly
9 owned subsidiary absent a showing of agency or alter ego liability. (*Sonora Diamond Co. v.*
10 *Superior Court* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 523, 538-540.) "As a practical matter, the parent must be
11 shown to have moved beyond the establishment of general policy and direction for the subsidiary
12 and in effect taken over performance of the subsidiary's *day-to-day* operations in carrying out
13 that policy." (Id. at 542, emphasis in original.)

14 While evidence was introduced that JCCI is a wholly owned subsidiary of Johnson &
15 Johnson, no evidence was adduced as to why JCCI was created; that JCCI was created to make
16 the products on behalf of Johnson & Johnson; who JCI's officers and directors are or whether
17 they overlap with Johnson & Johnson's; that JCCI is undercapitalized; that Johnson & Johnson
18 controlled JCCI's day-to-day operations, nor any other evidence suggesting that an alter ego or
19 agency theory could be put to the jury. Further, the jury was not instructed on these theories of
20 liability as the evidence adduced was insufficient to support such instructions.

21 Echeverria argues that Telofski, who was designated as the person most knowledgeable
22 for both Johnson & Johnson and JJCI (Tr. 800:11-18), distinguished between the two companies
23 on only three occasions in her testimony. (Id. at Tr. 801:23-802:4; 804:7-19; 813:10-23.) She
24 argues that for the vast majority of her testimony, Telofski used the words, "Johnson &
25 Johnson." Echeverria, however, does not indicate the subject matters on which Telofski was

1 designated to testify. Further, Echeverria's counsel was aware when Telofski's deposition was
2 taken that Telofski was an employee of JJCI and that there were two separate corporations. To
3 the extent counsel asked questions regarding Johnson & Johnson, Telofski properly answered
4 them on behalf of that entity.

5 Finally, Echeverria notes the experts all referred to "Johnson & Johnson." That experts
6 or third parties referred to "Johnson & Johnson" does not save the verdict. None were asked to
7 opine that Johnson & Johnson (as opposed to JJCI) manufactured or distributed the products
8 after 1967 and indeed it was not shown that any would have had such knowledge.

9 Apparently recognizing that the oral testimony does not support a finding that Johnson &
10 Johnson manufactured or distributed the products after 1967 Echeverria orally argued that
11 Johnson & Johnson "hired someone" (JJCI) to make the products for it after 1967 but "kept
12 responsibility" for them, thereby imposing on Johnson & Johnson responsibility for placing a
13 warning on the products at all times. The documentary evidence and oral testimony that supports
14 these factual assertions is not of a quality sufficient to sustain the verdict.

15 First, and as noted above, there was no evidence that Johnson & Johnson "hired" JJCI to
16 make products for it. Further, the documents do not support an alter ego or agency theory of
17 liability. The documents may be grouped into several categories: those written by Johnson &
18 Johnson employees evidencing consideration of the marketing opportunities and obstacles for
19 talc (Ex. P-9 and Ex. P-10); documents showing that Johnson & Johnson sought to assert its
20 views in the scientific community as to what the scientific evidence showed vis-a-vis talc (Ex. P-
21 16, P-20, P-59, P-204, P 261 through P-264, P2-66, P-267); those that Echeverria argues show
22 that Johnson & Johnson declined to fund studies into research concerned with the possible link
23 between talc and ovarian cancer or would fund only if favorable results would be guaranteed
24 (Ex. P-55, P-262); and those that show that condom manufacturers and Imerys either ceased
25 using talc in their products or warned about its potential harm (Ex. P-19, P-27, P-396). In

1 addition, Echeverria argues that a document written by a JCCI employee shows that after 1967
2 Johnson & Johnson should be liable for its' subsidiary's failure to warn (Ex. P-764).

3 Considered individually or as a whole, and drawing all inferences in support of the
4 verdict, these documents could not be read by the jury as giving rise to a duty to warn on the part
5 of Johnson & Johnson after 1967.

6 The document on which Echeverria primarily relies to show that Johnson & Johnson was
7 "responsible" for JCCI is Exhibit P-764, dated January 11, 1994. This is a draft document (not
8 on letterhead) entitled "Talc Questions and Answers" that posed various questions and answers
9 regarding the state of knowledge regarding scientific research on the issue of the linkage between
10 talc and cancer and responding to various studies to date. The evidence at trial was that this
11 document was drafted by Don Jones who was in the research and planning group at JCCI. (Tr.
12 895:22-896:12; 902:4-19.) It made various references to Johnson & Johnson's decisions
13 regarding its labeling of Johnson's Baby Powder, indicated "Johnson & Johnson uses the highest
14 standards in making its baby powder," and stated "Johnson & Johnson had joined independent
15 researchers and the government in testing talc and that no link with cancer was found."

16 No showing was made as to what use, if any, the draft document was put. There was no
17 showing that Johnson & Johnson expressly or impliedly authorized these statements. Jones was
18 not called to testify and did not indicate the facts on which he based the statements related to
19 "Johnson & Johnson." In short, that a JCCI employee of unknown authority stated in a draft
20 document that "Johnson & Johnson" made decisions regarding labeling of the product or used
21 the highest standards in makings "its" baby powder or engaged in research is insufficient to
22 show, as a matter of law, that Johnson & Johnson in fact manufactured and labeled the product
23 or "kept responsibility" for JCCI after 1967. (*Young v. Horizon West, Inc.* (2013) 220
24 Cal.App.4th 1122, 1133; *van't Rood v. County of Santa Clara* (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 549,
25 571).

1 As to Johnson & Johnson's own acts, the assertions by Echeverria that Johnson &
2 Johnson employees considered marketing obstacles for talc based products is insufficient to
3 create an inference that Johnson & Johnson was liable for the acts of its subsidiary after 1967.

4 Exhibit P-9, a 1986 memo from Ashton's files referenced the fact that "safety of cosmetic
5 powders has been a concern, especially among health professionals. They have decided that
6 powders provide no health benefit. Therefore, the potential for harm from respirables or
7 accidental exposure should be avoided. Mothers are now being advised not to use baby powder,
8 especially talc baby powders." The document goes on to say that "retrospective studies have
9 implicated talc use in the vaginal area with the incidence of ovarian cancer. While a CFTA
10 sponsored animal study has shown talc does not migrate, this concern does affect use of powders
11 for adult women.... Based on the scientific evidence and extensive experience and use we
12 believe that cosmetic powders are safe for use in babies and adults." The document observes
13 that Johnson & Johnson holds patents for segregation of "super talc" and a cornstarch products
14 well as other patents and concludes that "J&J" is probably working at the limits of cosmetic
15 powders technology and "must pursue technologies which will provide a proven health benefit
16 for use of powders on babies." It also noted that it was possible to hypothesize that "pursuit of
17 technologies which would create talc based powders of higher interest (than JBP) to adults could
18 be profitable."

19 No evidence was adduced as to why this document was written or to whom (if anyone) it
20 was sent. Fairly read it suggests that a scientist at Johnson & Johnson (Ashton) was suggesting
21 that baby powder use was impacted by the health community and that Johnson & Johnson might
22 in the future pursue technologies to increase the use of cosmetic powders. It could not be fairly
23 inferred from this document that Johnson & Johnson controlled JCCI, or "kept responsibility" for
24 it.

1 Likewise, Exhibit P-10, a memo dated August 5, 1992, from a Johnson & Johnson file
2 but without testimony as to its author or recipients, indicated that an obstacle to marketing the
3 product was “negative publicity from the health community on talc (inhalation, dust, negative
4 doctor endorsement, cancer linkage)” and recommended investigation of an additive to reduce
5 dust. But, the document’s vague reference to negative publicity from a “cancer linkage,” without
6 more, was insufficient for a jury to find Johnson & Johnson “kept responsibility” for JCCI.

7 Nor are documents referencing the funding of studies sufficient to impose liability on
8 Johnson & Johnson. Exhibit P -55 was heavily relied upon by Echeverria. It is a 1975 memo on
9 Johnson & Johnson letterhead documenting that an employee named Gavin Hildick-Smith sent a
10 “small donation” to Keith Griffiths of the Tenovus Institute for Cancer Research in Cardiff,
11 England and suggesting that “it might be of value to identify the precise scientific data available
12 to Tenovus concerning talc and ovarian cells.” A handwritten note attached by D. Petterson
13 inquired as to whether Hildick-Smith advised in advance of this donation and opined that the
14 donation “has certainly given Griffiths the opening to put us on notice of the talc/ovary
15 problem.” Other than adducing testimony that Hildick-Smith was a doctor and Johnson &
16 Johnson employee (Tr. 883:19-28) no evidence was introduced as to the capacities of any of the
17 employees receiving the memo, or the role of “D. Petterson” at Johnson & Johnson or the
18 meaning of the term “talc/ovary problem.” Nor was there any showing that Griffiths ever had or
19 provided any research to Johnson & Johnson which might have actually put it on notice of a
20 “talc/ovary problem,” let alone that Johnson & Johnson controlled JCCI.

21 Nor does Exhibit P-262 support Echeverria’s argument. This e-mail chain indicates
22 Johnson & Johnson would financially support “the Huncharek/Muscat narrative on ovarian
23 cancer” but was not “Yet” prepared to support a “diaphragm/ovarian epidemiological study.”
24 That Johnson & Johnson declined to fund research could not be inferred by the jury to support a
25 finding that it controlled JCCI.

1 Exhibits P- 57 and P-27 are also insufficient to impose liability on Johnson & Johnson
2 for acts taking place after 1967. Exhibit P-57 is an agreement by Johnson & Johnson dated June
3 4, 1994 guaranteeing funding of \$10,000 to CFTA for the “management, coordination, and
4 development of scientific data ...pertaining to the safe use of talc,” agreeing to indemnify CFTA
5 with respect to same, and further acknowledging that any CFTA reports “will become public
6 documents.” While this document clearly indicates Johnson & Johnson sought to bring to the
7 public’s attention its views regarding the safety of talc it cannot be said, by inference or
8 otherwise, that it demonstrated that Johnson & Johnson exercised day-to day control over JCCI
9 sufficient to implicate the doctrines of alter ego or agency. Similarly, that either Johnson &
10 Johnson or JCCI sought to bring their views forward either on their own or through CFTA, to
11 IARC and others in the scientific community (Ex. P-16, P-20, P-59, P-204, P-238, P-261-264, P-
12 266, P-267) and strategized about how to do so did not create evidence that Johnson & Johnson
13 controlled JCCI to such an extent as to make it liable for JCCI’s decisions.

14 Documents from third parties also could not be relied upon to meet Echeverria’s burden
15 of proof. Exhibit P-16 to JCCI from a consultant (Wehner) suggesting that Johnson & Johnson
16 point out to the FDA the flaws in a proposed study and decline to fund same and Exhibit P-16
17 from Wehner to JCCI criticizing the manner in which CFTA analyzed certain data and noting
18 that its inaccuracies subject the industry to being perceived as the cigarette industry also could not
19 be used by the jury to infer that Johnson & Johnson was “responsible” for JCCI. As an initial
20 matter, Wehner goes on to state that the public perception “would be a particularly tragic
21 misperception in view of the fact that the industry does have powerful, valid arguments to
22 support its position.” More importantly, that a third party consultant advised JCCI as to what he
23 believed its parent should do vis-à-vis the CFTA does and cannot establish that Johnson &
24 Johnson is liable for warnings on products it did not make or distribute. (*Young v. Horizon West,*
25 *Inc.* 220 Cal.App.4th at 1133; *van’t Rood v. County of Santa Clara* 113 Cal. App. 4th at 571).

1 Similarly, Exhibit P-27, from Imery's Director of Product Safety, to Ashton, cautioning
2 that IARC could classify talc as potentially carcinogenic and suggesting that Ashton counsel his
3 management regarding same, as well as Exhibit P-396 between the same two persons,
4 transmitting an April 2004 scientific paper which the Imery's employee characterized as
5 "compelling" evidence of a theory as to how talc could cause ovarian cancer and cautioning that
6 the NTP could classify talc as a "causative agent" based thereon cannot be the basis for liability
7 against Johnson & Johnson. A third party (Imerys) cannot create a relationship showing that
8 Johnson & Johnson had "responsibility" for JCCI, any more than the acts of a purported agent
9 suffice to show a principal-agent relationship. (Id.)

10 Finally, the fact that Johnson & Johnson was aware that condom manufacturers
11 discontinued the use of talc in its products in 1994 (Ex. P-19) or that Imerys put a warning on its
12 MSDS (Ex. P-37) in 2006 does not establish that talc was known or should have been known to
13 cause ovarian cancer prior to 2007 or that Johnson & Johnson was "responsible" for JCCI
14 thereby. As to the condom issue, Echeverria introduced evidence that another of her experts
15 (Plunkett), in her report, relied on a 1994 newspaper article that opined that condom
16 manufacturers removed talc from their products "in part due to ovarian cancer concerns." No
17 evidence was admitted, however, as to what those concerns were (i.e. whether the condom
18 industry ceased to use talc because the available science supported a conclusion that talc was a
19 *probable* cause of ovarian cancer or because the concerns surrounded publicity of the *possibility*
20 of such a link) and the jury was specifically instructed that the facts set forth in the article were
21 not admitted for their truth. As such, evidence as to what the condom industry did could not
22 have properly been considered by the jury to establish knowledge on the part of Johnson &
23 Johnson, much less determine it was "responsible" for JCCI's decisions regarding warnings.

1 Likewise, the decision by Imerys in 2006 to put a statement on its MSDS that restated IARC's
2 2006 conclusion that talc was a "possible" carcinogen could not be used to show that in 2007
3 Johnson & Johnson had a duty to warn, or that it was responsible for JCCI.

4 Following oral argument on these motions Echeverria argued for the first time (in
5 supplemental papers filed October 13, 2017 and not authorized by the Court but nonetheless
6 considered) that Johnson & Johnson had an on-going duty to warn consumers and to recall the
7 products. The cases cited by Echeverria, however, stand for the proposition that a manufacturer
8 of equipment *who continues to market the equipment* and determines it is likely to be dangerous
9 has a duty to recall the product or retrofit it. (*Hernandez v Badger Constr. Equip Co.* (1994): 28
10 Cal. App. 4th 1791, 1827; *Lunghi v Clark Equip. Co. Inc.* (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 485, 494.)
11 Echeverria cites no authority for the proposition that a manufacturer who has ceased to make the
12 product must cause a warning to be placed on the product by another manufacturer or cause that
13 manufacturer to recall the product. Moreover, Echeverria did not ask the jury to be instructed on
14 this basis under CACI 1223 or otherwise and cannot assert it for the first time after oral argument
15 on post-trial motions.

16 17 **(2) Punitive Damages**

18 As to punitive damages Echeverria was required to show by clear and convincing
19 evidence that Johnson & Johnson acted with malice, i.e. "despicable conduct which is carried on
20 by the defendant with a willful and conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others." Cal.
21 Civ. Code § 3294 subd. (c)(1).

22
23 The term "despicable," though not defined in the statute, is applicable to
24 "circumstances that are 'base,' 'vile,' or 'contemptible.'" (*College Hospital Inc.*
25 *v. Superior Court* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 704, 725 [34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 898, 882 P.2d 894],

1 quoting 4 Oxford English Dict. (2d ed. 1989) p. 529.) Under the statute, “malice
2 does not require actual intent to harm. [Citation.] Conscious disregard for the
3 safety of another may be sufficient where the defendant is aware of the probable
4 dangerous consequences of his or her conduct and he or she willfully fails to avoid
5 such consequences. [Citation.] Malice may be proved either expressly through
6 direct evidence or by implication through indirect evidence from which the jury
7 draws inferences. [Citation.]” (*Angie M. v. Superior Court* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th
8 1217, 1228 [44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197].)
9 *Pfeifer v. John Crane, Inc.* (2013) 220 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1299.

10 Because Johnson & Johnson is a corporate defendant Echeverria was also required to
11 show by clear and convincing evidence that a director or managing agent acted with malice. Cal.
12 Civ. Code, § 3294, subd. (b). “A plaintiff may satisfy the ‘managing agent’ requirement of Civil
13 Code section 3294, subdivision (b), through evidence showing the information in the possession
14 of the corporation and the structure of management decisionmaking that permits an inference
15 that the information in fact moved upward to a point where corporate policy was formulated.
16 These inferences cannot be based merely on speculation, but they may be established by
17 circumstantial evidence, in accordance with ordinary standards of proof.” (*Romo v. Ford Motor*
18 *Co.* (1999) 99 Cal. App. 4th 1115, 1141, disapproved on other grounds in *People v. Ault* (2004)
19 33 Cal. 4th 1250.)

20 The only employee of Johnson & Johnson referenced in the pre-1967 documents that
21 Echeverria contends support punitive damages against Johnson & Johnson was William Ashton.
22 There was no showing as to Ashton’s capacity at Johnson & Johnson sufficient to support a
23 punitive damage award. The testimony offered by Telofski was that Ashton was deceased, had
24 retired some years earlier, and was in “research and development” at the time he left the
25 company. Telofski testified she was “not sure if he was a manager or director level” when he

1 left the company. Telofski went on to say she “really just doesn’t know.” (Ex. 1 and 2 to
2 Defendants’ Compendium of Trial Transcripts.) No questions were asked as to Ashton’s
3 position in 1964.

4 Post 1967 the only Johnson & Johnson employees identified were Neal Matheson, who
5 signed Exhibit P-57 in 1994 and was Executive Vice President of Research & Development and
6 identified by Telofski as a “vice president in R &D” (Tr. 805:25-27) and Steve Mann, who
7 “worked” at Johnson & Johnson (Tr. 805: 15-17) and whose title was shown as “Director,
8 Toxicology.” Mann communicated regarding funding the “Huncharek/Muscat study” (Exhibit
9 P-262) and Matheson and Mann exchanged e-mail correspondence regarding the CFTA Task
10 Force and steps Johnson & Johnson might take to bring its views to the attention of IARC and
11 others in the scientific community and monitored IARC’s conclusions (Exhibits P- 204, P-261
12 through P-264, P-266, P-267). Assuming that the jury could infer that these persons were
13 managing agents of Johnson & Johnson there was no showing that either engaged in manifest
14 disregard of safety or was reckless in not causing Johnson & Johnson to warn that talc was a
15 “probable” cause of cancer. The best that can be said from the evidence is that they were aware
16 IARC classified talc as “possibly” carcinogenic, a standard insufficient as a matter of law to
17 require any warning, even had Johnson & Johnson been the manufacturer of the product.

18 In short, there was simply no evidence that Johnson & Johnson knew in the 1965-1967
19 time period that talc more likely than not caused ovarian cancer, giving rise to a duty to warn,
20 much less that a managing agent acted with requisite malice in failing to give the warning. Nor
21 is the verdict saved by reference to argument that documents existing after 1967 can create a
22 basis for liability as to Johnson & Johnson based on JCCI’s failure to warn. The documents and
23 testimony, granting all inferences in favor of Echeverria, as a matter of law do not support
24 liability on an agency or alter ego theory, much less support a finding by clear and convincing
25

1 evidence that a punitive damage award was appropriate. For these reasons alone the JNOV
2 motion must be granted as to Johnson & Johnson.

3 Further, and as discussed below, Echeverria failed to meet her burden of proof to show
4 that her use of Johnson's Baby Powder and Shower to Shower were the probable cause of her
5 ovarian cancer. Thus, as to both Johnson & Johnson and JCCI the motion for JNOV must be
6 granted.

8 **III. JCCI'S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING THE VERDICT**

9 **A. Summary of the Argument**

10 Defendants advance three arguments as to why JNOV must be granted based on the
11 argument that Echeverria failed to present evidence sufficient to show that her use of talc based
12 products was the probable cause of her ovarian cancer. Specifically, they argue that Echeverria's
13 specific causation expert, Yessaian, failed to present epidemiology showing talc was the more
14 probable than not cause of her cancer and used an improper methodology for determining the
15 cause of her cancer (differential etiology) given the lack of epidemiology. JCCI also argues that
16 no substantial evidence was presented to show that it had a duty to warn prior to 2007 and that as
17 a result JNOV on both the general and punitive damage awards must be granted.

18 Echeverria contends that the motion is not well taken, as she had no obligation to present
19 epidemiologic evidence. She further argues that Yessaian properly engaged in a differential
20 etiology. She argues further that other experts (Plunkett, Godleski, Siemiatycki) established
21 general causation. Finally, she argues that internal documents pre-dating 2007, discussed supra,
22 showed that genital use of talc was not safe and knew that others in the industry warned of its
23 dangers, supporting the punitive damage award against JCCI.

24 //

1 **B. The *Sargon* Ruling and a Summary of Yessaian’ s Testimony**

2 In evaluating defendants’ causation arguments, background concerning the general
3 causation testimony that was offered is necessary, as is an understanding of the permitted scope
4 of Yessaian’s testimony.

5 Prior to trial defendants made a series of motions under *Sargon Enterprises, Inc. v.*
6 *University of Southern Cal.* (2012) 55 Cal.4th 747 to exclude various expert testimony. Certain
7 general causation experts were excluded and the testimony of others was limited. A written
8 order issued, as did an oral clarification. (Tr. of July 18, 2017 at 5: 23-6:27.) Yessaian was
9 permitted to opine that, using a “differential etiology methodology,” it was “more probable than
10 not” that Echeverria’s cancer was caused by her use of talc based on Echeverria’s medical
11 history; the fact that talc was found in her ovarian tissue; 4 epidemiological studies involving
12 women using talcum powder who were diagnosed with ovarian cancer which showed an “odds
13 ratio” in excess of 2.0 thus permitting Yessaian to “rule in’ talc as a causative agent; and other
14 studies generally showed an odds ratio of 1.22 to 1.39. She was not permitted to testify that
15 inflammation of cells was involved in Echeverria’s cancer.

16 The testimony at trial by Yessaian on specific causation was to the effect that her
17 methodology in determining the probable cause of Echeverria’s cancer was to engage in a
18 “differential diagnosis,” or “differential etiology,” (Tr. 2609:16-18.) She explained that this
19 process involved identifying risks for a disease; ruling out risk factors that you don't believe
20 apply; and ruling in what you believe is the cause of the cancer. (Tr. 2812:18-21.) She testified
21 that she ruled out 13 other potential known risk factors for ovarian cancer that could be
22 applicable to Echeverria (genetics; history of family members with cancer at an early age or
23 breast or ovarian cancer; early onset of menarche; age, age at menopause; obesity; polycystic
24 ovarian syndrome; endometriosis; tobacco and alcohol use; use of hormone replacement therapy)
25 and considered “protective factors” (number of pregnancies and births; breast feeding; use of

1 birth control pills; tubal ligation) (Tr. 2647:9 - 2648:18). She testified she considered talc use a
2 risk factor based on epidemiological studies as well as the number of applications of talc
3 Echeverria had, which she estimated to exceed 30,000 and the number of years of talc usage
4 prior to diagnosis (32) (Tr. 2612:15 - 2613:2) and also considered the "mechanism" by which it
5 is theorized that talc migrates to the ovaries, the fact that talc was found in Echeverria's ovarian
6 tissue, and the literature suggesting that talc exposure causes cancer by inflammation that
7 ultimately leads to malignant transformation of cells (Tr. 2613:10 - 2614:11; 2618:3- 2618:25;
8 Tr. 2611:11 - 2612:4; 2621:21-2630:6; 2675:8-2676:21).

9 As to the testimony that inflammation was considered the mechanism by which talc
10 caused Echeverria's cancer, the opinion including that testimony was stricken as no
11 inflammation was found in Echeverria's tissue. (Tr. 2645: 18-20.) Yessaian then testified more
12 generally that she considered the mechanism by which talc is hypothesized to cause ovarian
13 cancer is by way of inflammatory processes. (Tr. 2646: 1-9.)

14 In reaching her conclusion that talc was a risk factor to be considered Yessaian relied on
15 four epidemiologic studies (Cramer 1982; Rosenblatt 1992; Cramer 1999; and Wu 2009) that
16 showed odds ratios in excess of 2.0 that a woman using talc would develop ovarian cancer (i.e.
17 that she had 50% or greater chance of developing cancer than women who did not use talc), as
18 well as 26 case controlled studies, 5 cohort studies showing "odds ratios" of 1.2 or 1.3, which
19 she opined showed that the women in those studies had a "trend of thirty percent increase in
20 risk," and meta-analysis and pooled analysis (Tr. 2658:5-12; 2820: 6-28; 2818:1-15). Yessaian
21 admitted at trial that she knows of no studies showing a risk ratio over 2.0 for serous invasive
22 ovarian cancer, which is the type of cancer with which Echeverria was diagnosed (Tr. 2896:1-
23 2897:16) and that one study on which she relied (Cramer 1999) showed an odds ratio of 1.70 for
24 serous ovarian cancer (Tr. 2672: 6- 20) and a second (Wu 2009) also showed an odds ratio of
25 1.70 for serous ovarian cancer (Tr. 2672:21-2673:5). She interpreted those results as a 70%

1 increased risk (Tr. 2896: 12-13.) She further testified that other studies on which she relied that
2 showed an odds ratio of less than 2.0 were useful because they showed an increased risk of
3 cancer developing in talc users and testified that specific studies showed this. She testified a
4 study by Gertig (2000) showed a 1.4 odds ratio and interpreted this as meaning the subjects had a
5 40% increase in risk for serous ovarian cancer in women using talc (Tr. 2668:12-2669:19) and
6 that a study by Gates (2008) showed an odds ratio of 1.6, which she interpreted as meaning that
7 women who used talc had a 60% increase in the risk of developing serous ovarian cancer
8 compared to those who did not (Tr. 2669:20-27) and that a “pooled” study by Terry (2013) had
9 an “odds ratio” of 1.20 for serous ovarian cancer, which she interpreted as translating to a 20%
10 increase in risk (Tr. 2670:11-15). She further acknowledged that Wu (2009) showed that a
11 person with genital use of talc with 15,600-52,000 applications showed an odds ratio of 1.34 and
12 acknowledged that the number was statistically insignificant (Tr. 2910: 21-25).

13 Yessaian also testified that because Echeverria was obese the estrogen effects of an
14 increased body mass index might serve in combination with other factors to increase her ovarian
15 cancer risk (Tr. 2870: 24-26) but stated that obesity more probable than not did not contribute to
16 her cancer because elevated BMI is not associated with high grade serous ovarian cancer. (Tr.
17 2866: 16-22.) She testified she “ruled out” age as a possible cause of cancer although “it could
18 have gone either way.” (Tr. 2870:19-21.) She admitted that Echeverria’s risk of ovarian cancer
19 was increased by her number of ovulations but stated it was “less likely than not.” (Tr. 2881:15-
20 22.) She acknowledged that cancer is “multifactorial” (Tr. 2875: 4-10) and admitted that when
21 she “ruled” out risk factors she ruled them out because it was “less than 50 percent likely that
22 they were the factor.” (Tr. 2883: 18-19).

23 She further testified that although many cancers have no known cause, she did not “rule
24 out” unknown causes and that it was not possible to do so. After admitting idiopathic causes are
25 the leading cause of ovarian cancer and that it was probable Echeverria’s cancer was caused by

1 some risk factor science does not yet know about (Tr. 2864:26-2688:27), Yessaian testified that
2 there was less than a 50% chance Echeverria's cancer was idiopathic. (Tr. 2888:19-26; 2890:28-
3 2891:1; 2894:13-18.) However, she could not put a "percentage" on how less likely that was.
4 (Tr. 2894: 20-21.)

5 **C. Analysis**

6 Following trial if the Court is convinced that there is no substantial conflict in the
7 evidence and that the tendered expert opinions do not show specific causation (which, under
8 *Jones v Ortho. Phar. Corp.* (1996) 163 Cal. App. 3d 396, must be shown by expert testimony in
9 a case alleging cancer) a JNOV is properly granted. *See Osborn v. Irwin Mem'l Blood Bank*
10 (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 234, 275. After considering it in totality and weighing all inferences in
11 favor of Echeverria, the Court is persuaded that Yessaian's opinion is insufficient as a matter of
12 law to support the verdict.

13 **(1) Specific Causation Was Not Shown**

14 **(i) Yessaian Did Not Have a Basis to "Rule In" Talc**

15
16
17 Yessaian was the only expert called on specific causation. She did not rely on the
18 testimony of Plunkett or Siemiatycki in forming her opinions. Thus, while the jury could well
19 have evaluated the credibility and reliability of her opinions by comparing them to information
20 provided by Plunkett and Siemiatycki, her determination that talc was a cause of ovarian cancer
21 and was the "more probable than not" cause of Echeverria's cancer is dependent only upon her
22 testimony and that of Godleski. As to the latter, there was no dispute that he testified to locating
23 talc in Echeverria's pathology tissue. Thus, the evidence is not in conflict.
24
25

1 In conducting a differential etiology⁴ Yessaian was required first to establish talc is a
2 probable cause of ovarian cancer. Without establishing that fact, she could not “rule in” talc as a
3 probable cause of Echeverria’s disease. As Yessaian explained, and as case law makes clear: “In
4 performing a differential diagnosis, a physician begins by ‘ruling in’ all scientifically plausible
5 causes of the plaintiff’s injury. The physician then ‘rules out’ the least plausible causes of injury
6 until the most likely cause remains. The final result of a differential diagnosis is the expert’s
7 conclusion that a defendant’s product caused (or did not cause) the plaintiff’s injury.” (*Glastetter*
8 *v. Novartis Pharms. Corp.* (8th Cir. 2001) 252 F.3d 986, 989. *See also Cooper v. Takeda*
9 *Pharmaceuticals America, Inc.* (2015), 239 Cal. App. 4th 555, 593-594.)

10 The only basis upon which Yessaian opined that talc is a scientifically plausible cause of
11 ovarian cancer was epidemiology and general reference to inflammation. But, none of the four
12 studies on which she was permitted to rely (Cramer 1982; Rosenblatt 1992; Cramer 1999; and
13 Wu 2009) showed odds ratios in excess of 2.0 that a woman using talc would develop serous
14 ovarian cancer (i.e. that she had 50% or greater chance of developing cancer than women who
15 did not use talc). Two did not break out serous ovarian cancer, although Yessaian admitted that
16
17

18 ⁴ Defendants argue that the use of a differential etiology methodology was not proper in
19 the first instance because the testimony at trial was to the effect that when the causes of a disease
20 are largely unknown (as was testified to by both Yessaian and defense experts), a differential
21 etiology “is of little assistance.” Restatement (Third) of Torts: Phys. & Emot. Harm § 28 cmt. 4
22 (2010); S. Breyer et. al., *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence* 3d Ed. (2011) 618 & n. 214.
23 The Court need not reach this issue as, even if the methodology could be used here, it was
24 employed improperly.
25

1 it was important to focus on histological type (Tr. 2896:1-4; 2834:27-2835:12.) The two that
2 did (Cramer 1999 and Wu 2009) showed a relative risk ratio of 1.70.

3 The other studies on which Yessaian relied to show talc was a scientifically plausible
4 cause of serous ovarian cancer all showed relative risk ratios well below 2.0, i.e. in the range of
5 1.3. Those statistics tend to *disprove* causation, as they show talc does not double the risk of
6 harm. (*Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.* (9th Cir. 1995) 43 F. 3d 1311, 1321 (Emphasis in
7 original); *In re Lipitor (Atorvastatin Calcium) Mktg., Sales Prac. & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, (D.S.C.
8 2016) 185 F. Supp. 3d 786, 791-92.) In this regard, it is to be recalled that the risk ratios being
9 cited are *relative* risk-ratios—comparing the risk that someone who uses talc will develop
10 ovarian cancer to the risk that someone who did not use talc will also develop cancer. A relative
11 risk ratio of 1.3 is well below the two-fold risk level necessary to show that talc “more probably
12 than not” causes cancer. *See Marder v. G. D. Searle* (1986) 630 F. Supp. 1087, 1092.

13 Further, defendants showed (and it is not disputed) that the most recent study (Cramer
14 2016) found the relative risk ratio for serous ovarian cancer for persons like Echeverria who
15 were post-menopausal when they developed cancer; had not used hormone replacement therapy;
16 and had used talc for 24 years was 1.0—i.e. no greater and no less than women in the population
17 at large.

18 Echeverria argues that epidemiological studies were not required to prove causation,
19 citing *In re Neurontin Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation* (D.
20 Mass.2009) 612 F.Supp.2d 116, 132. (Opposition at 16, FN 8.) However, the fact is that in
21 ruling talc “in” Yessaian relied almost entirely on epidemiological studies. To argue that
22 epidemiological studies are not *required* to establish causation is not persuasive given they were
23 utilized for such purpose.

24 Nor is it sufficient to argue that Yessaian did not rely solely on epidemiological studies or
25 that such studies formed only one facet of the factors she considered. (Opposition at 16:25 – 26.)

1 Although Yessaian testified that epidemiology was just one of the factors she looked at, she did
2 not mention any others. (Tr. 2657:25- 2658:12 and 2673:10-2674:8.) She did reference prior
3 testimony wherein she, “listed all the factors and elements that I evaluated.” Presumably she was
4 referencing testimony at Tr. 2629:20-2630:6, cited in Echeverria’s Opposition at 14:28, along
5 with a picture of the board on which Yessaian wrote her list. Within that testimony, Dr. Yessaian
6 ruled out other causes of Echeverria’s ovarian cancer, but did not find any other factor to rule in
7 talc as a disease agent other than epidemiology.

8 In this regard it should be noted that Yessaian also did not “rule in” talc as a disease agent
9 based on the testimony of Godleski or her general understanding that that there is a plausible
10 biological mechanism (inflammation) by which it may be hypothesized that talc causes cancer,
11 nor could she in the absence of evidence that Echeverria had such inflammation.

12 The undisputed evidence was that epidemiology was the *only* basis that Yessaian could
13 and did “rule in” talc as a disease agent. That evidence was extremely limited and, at best,
14 consisted of two studies (Cramer 1982 and Rosenblatt 1992) showing a relative risk ratio in
15 excess of 2.0. In light of the other studies presented and, in particular the studies on which
16 Yessaian relied that showed that when stratified for serous ovarian cancer, the risk was 1.7 and
17 for those with characteristics most closely aligned with Echeverria’s (serous ovarian cancer, no
18 use of hormone replacement therapy, and use of 24 years) no increased risk was shown,
19 substantial evidence was not provided by Yessaian to “rule in” talc.

20
21 **(ii) Yessaian Did Not “Rule Out” Other Causes of Cancer**

22 As to what Dr. Yessaian “ruled out” in her differential etiology, Yessaian was able to
23 testify based on Echeverria’s medical and personal history that some disease agents (genetics;
24 history of family members with cancer at an early age or breast or ovarian cancer; polycystic
25 ovarian syndrome; endometriosis; tobacco and alcohol use; use of hormone replacement therapy)
could be “ruled out.” However, as to others (age, number of ovulatory cycles, obesity) Yessaian

1 did not rule them out. She testified instead that in her opinion it was less probable than not that
2 they caused Echeverria's disease. She testified that "nobody" could eliminate obesity (Tr.
3 2876:28-2878:12) or age (Tr. 2876:4-14), and that although a high number of ovulatory cycles
4 was a risk factor for ovarian cancer, Echeverria's number of ovulatory cycles was "less likely
5 than not" the cause of the disease (Tr. 2881:20-2882:23). Thus, she did not eliminate these
6 potential causes but instead, "discounted" them. As to obesity she did so on the basis of studies
7 showing that obesity was not statistically linked to serous ovarian cancer (although it is linked to
8 breast and uterine cancer) but as to age and number of ovulatory cycles, her testimony had no
underpinning.

9 Likewise, she conceded that idiopathic causes are the leading cause of ovarian cancer and
10 that it was *probable* Echeverria's cancer was caused by some risk factor science does not yet
11 know about (Tr. 2864:26-2688:27), yet testified that there was less than a 50% chance
12 Echeverria's cancer was idiopathic. (Tr. 2888:19-26; 2890:28-2891:1; 2894:13-18.) However,
13 she could not put a "percentage" on how less likely that was. (TR 2894: 20-21).

14 The Court is of the firm view that Yessaian's "ruling out" of age and ovulatory cycles,
15 amounted to no more than speculation. Her testimony that it was "probable" the cause of the
16 cancer was unknown, but then putting a "less than 50% chance" on same (with no reasoning)
17 likewise amounted to mere speculation. Those facts show that the expert did not properly
18 employ the methodology she espoused and independent of the fact that there was no evidence of
19 substance to rule talc "in," persuade the Court that JNOV must be granted to JCCI and Johnson
20 & Johnson on the basis that no specific causation was shown.

21 22 **(2) Defendants' Arguments Regarding Scientific Knowledge**

23 Defendants argue that there was no substantial evidence supporting a duty to warn
24 because such duty only arises when a product is shown to be dangerous based on scientific
25 knowledge available to the manufacturer. Echeverria argues that pursuant to *Carlin v. Superior*

1 Court (1996) 13 Cal.4th 1104, 1112-1113, in negligent failure to warn cases there is no
2 “generally recognized and prevailing best scientific and medical knowledge” requirement. This
3 is a misreading of the case. As the *Carlin* court explained, the difference between a strict liability
4 failure to warn and a negligence based failure to warn case is that in a strict liability setting, even
5 a reasonably prudent defendant manufacturer (with no duty to warn under a negligence standard)
6 may be liable if the trier of fact concludes based on scientific information available to the
7 manufacturer, the failure to warn rendered the product unsafe. (Id. at 1113.) Conversely, a
8 manufacturer who is aware of scientific evidence of a level of risk may be found to have acted
9 within the standard of care by not warning of the risk if, for example, it had other contrary
10 evidence. (Id. at 1112.) Under either scenario, scientific knowledge is required for liability.
11 “Under a negligence standard, a reasonable manufacturer would not be charged with knowing
12 more than what would come to light from the prevailing scientific and medical knowledge.”
13 (*Valentine v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.* (1999) 68 Cal.App.4th 1467, 1483-1484.) However,
14 defendants did not ask for an instruction in this regard and cannot now use that as a ground for
15 JNOV.⁵

16 17 (3) JNOV to JJCI As To Punitive Damages Is Warranted

18 JJCI argues that at a minimum a partial JNOV on the issue of punitive damages should
19 be granted as there was no substantial clear and convincing evidence of malice. Cal. Civ. Code
20 §3294(a). Echeverria contends that notwithstanding the fact that the scientific community was
21 (and is) divided on the question of whether talc causes ovarian cancer, internal documents
22 showed that JJCI “knew or should have known” that talc was dangerous or likely to be
23 dangerous giving rise to a duty to warn and that its failure to do so was in callous disregard of the
24

25 ⁵ Defendants asked for and received an instruction as to custom and practice (CACI 413)

1 safety of the public. Specifically, she contends that JJCI was on notice that condom
2 manufacturers ceased using talc in the early 1990s and was aware of the scientific studies both
3 from its consultant (Wehner) and from the literature generally. At trial Echeverria argued that
4 the literature, in particular Ex. P- 105 (Harlow 1992) and Ex. P- 107 (Cramer 1999)
5 demonstrated that ten percent of ovarian cancer cases in the United States are *caused* by the use
6 of talc based powders and from that fact Echeverria argued that JJCI should have warned about
7 the risk associated with the use of talc.

8 This is a misreading of the evidence. Ex. P-105 was an epidemiologic study that
9 concluded that *if* a cause association were to pertain to daily users or users with more than
10 10,000 exposures applying the odds ratios in the study to the exposure rate among cases the
11 proportion of ovarian cancer incidence was approximately 10%. Exhibit P-107 stated that there
12 was a consistent association between talc and ovarian cancer that appeared to be unlikely to be
13 explained by recall or confounding. The dose response relationship was deemed weak. The
14 authors hypothesized a biologically plausible causation mechanism and called for appropriate
15 warnings noting that avoidance of talc in genital hygiene use might *reduce* the occurrence of
16 ovarian cancer by at least 10%. Other research, both before and after this, and in particular in the
17 time period 1980 to 2008, including a published 1995 report based on a joint symposium co-
18 sponsored by the FDA, the CFTA, and The International Association of Regulatory Toxicology
19 & Pharmacology in January 2004 (Ex. D-205) reported that “while some weak association
20 between talc exposure and ovarian tumors has been reported it was not sufficient warning for
21 concern” and concluded that “the possibility of an association of talc exposure and ovarian
22 cancer is an important hypothesis of potential public health concern. However, this association
23 remains a research hypothesis whose verification or falsification needs additional study.” These
24 additional studies took place, were considered by IARC in 2006, and led it to conclude that talc
25

1 was a "possible" rather than "probable" cause of ovarian cancer. (Ex. P-29; Tr. 1196:7-23;
2 1198:8-1200:2; 2162: 18- 263: 10; 2282:5-2283: 28; 2285:23-26; 2291: 15-23.)

3 Significantly, Echeverria cites to no internal research or study by JCCI that was not in
4 the public scientific domain. Thus, there was no showing beyond the publicly available literature
5 that would show JCCI "knew or should have known" of the dangers of talc prior to 2007.

6 She also contends that internal documents, referenced above, showed that JCCI was
7 attempting to influence the scientific debate at NTP, sought to influence opinion leaders, and
8 sought to cause IARC not to list talc as "probably" carcinogenic, and declined to fund studies
9 that it did not believe were favorable to it. These documents and theories are discussed, supra.
10 The documents, beyond showing that Johnson & Johnson did not control JCCI, also do not
11 constitute substantial evidence to support the punitive damages verdict against JCCI. The only
12 document shown to have been written by a JCCI employee was P-764, the draft "Q & A".

13 While that document demonstrates JCCI had knowledge of the science available at that time, it
14 does not show that anyone at JCCI (much less a managing agent or employee) determined or
15 should have determined that talc was a probable cause of cancer based on the science available.

16 Further, and as discussed above, that condom manufacturers ceased using talc in its
17 products, without further information as to why they did so and that the information was known
18 to JCCI, or that Imerys disclosed the IARC classification on its MSDS, does not show a
19 conscious disregard for safety. Echeverria's own expert, who chaired the IARC panel giving rise
20 to its classification of talc as "possibly" carcinogenic testified that in his opinion the scientific
21 evidence was insufficient to show as of 2007 that there was a causal relationship between
22 perineal talc use and ovarian cancer risk. (TR: 2300:9-14; 2300:15-19; 2362:11-22; 2355:24-
23 2359:2; 239:3-13; 2363:10-2364:14; 2368:11-25.) The Merritt study (2008) (Ex. L-811) also
24 concluded "chronic inflammation does not play a major role in the development of ovarian
25 cancer."

1 Reviewing all of the evidence in the light most favorable to Echeverria the best that can
2 be said is that there was (and is) an on-going debate in the scientific and medical community
3 about whether talc more probably than not causes ovarian cancer and thus giving rise to a duty to
4 warn. Clear and convincing evidence of malice is lacking. In such circumstances an award of
5 punitive damages based on theory of negligent failure to warn of the dangers cannot be
6 sustained. *Cf. Kendall Yacht Corp. v. United California Bank* (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 949, 959;
7 *Satcher v Honda Motor Co.* (5th Cir. 1995) 52 F. 3d 1311.

8 9 **IV. MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL**

10 **A. Procedural Requirements and Legal Standard**

11 **(1) Timeliness**

12 A party intending to move for a new trial must file notice of intention to move for new
13 trial designating the grounds upon which the motion is made, after a decision is rendered and
14 before entry of judgment, or within 15 days of the date of mailing notice of entry of judgment.
15 CCP §659. The Court mailed notice of entry of judgment on August 21, 2017. Defendants filed
16 their Notice of Intention to Move for New Trial on September 5, 2017. The motion is timely.

17 A motion for new trial must be ruled on within 60 days of mailing of notice of entry of
18 judgment by the clerk or any party (whichever is earlier), or if no notice is given, 60 days after
19 filing of the first notice of intent to move for new trial; after such time the court loses its power
20 to rule on a motion for new trial. Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §663a.

21 The last day for the Court to rule on the motion is October 20, 2017 (60 days from
22 August 21, 2017).

23 **(2) Legal Standard**

24 Courts have no inherent right to order a new trial; the right is purely statutory and must
25 be based on one of the grounds enumerated in the statute. (*In re Marriage of Herr* (2009) 174

1 Cal.App.4th 1463, 1465; *Fomco, Inc. v. Joe Maggio, Inc.* (1961) 55 Cal.2d 162, 166.) The
2 potential bases for granting a new trial are enumerated in Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §657.

3 Defendants' motion is based on the following:

- 4 (1) Insufficiency of the evidence to justify the verdict, or the verdict is against the law -
§657(6)
- 5
- 6 (2) Irregularity in the proceeding of the court, jury, and/or adverse party, or orders of the
court or abuse of discretion by which Defendants were prevented from having a fair
7 trial - §657(1)
- 8 (3) Error in law occurring at trial and excepted to by Defendants - §657(7).
- 9
- 10 (4) Misconduct of the jury - §657(2)
- 11 (5) Excessive damages - §657(5)
- 12

13 **B. Analysis**

14

15 **(1) Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §657(6) –Insufficiency of evidence arguments**

16 “Insufficiency of the evidence is one of the most frequent grounds for new trial motions.
17 It is also one as to which the trial judge has the broadest power.” (Civil Trials and Evidence at
18 18:170.) The trial court is said to sit as the thirteenth juror and to have plenary power to order a
19 new trial based on insufficiency of evidence. (*Barrese v. Murray* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 494,
20 503.) “While it is the exclusive province of the jury to find the facts, it is the duty of the trial
21 court to see that this function is intelligently and justly performed, and in the exercise of its
22 supervisory power over the verdict, the court, on motion for a new trial, should consider the
23 probative force of the evidence and satisfy itself that the evidence as a whole is sufficient to
24 sustain the verdict.” (*People v. Robarge* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 628, 633 [262 P.2d 14].) Insufficiency
25 of the evidence in this context means “an absence of evidence or that the evidence received, in

1 the individual judgment of the trial judge, is lacking in probative force to establish the
2 proposition of fact to which it is addressed.” (*People v. Capps* (1984) 159 Cal.App.3d 546, 552,
3 fn. 5 [205 Cal.Rptr. 898].) The court must independently assess the evidence supporting the
4 verdict. (*Ibid.*) The court’s plenary power includes the power and duty to reweigh evidence (*Tice*
5 *v. Kaiser Co.* (1951) 102 Cal.App.2d 44, 46; *Armstrong v. Svoboda* (1966) 240 Cal.App.2d 472,
6 473), and to consider the credibility of witnesses and draw inferences that differ from those of
7 the jury (*Casella v. SouthWest Dealer Services, Inc.* (2007) 157 Cal.App.4th 1127, 1159-1160).
8 In reweighing evidence, trial courts are to be guided by a presumption that the verdict is correct.
9 (*Ryan v. Crown Castle NG Networks, Inc.* (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 775, 785.)

10 Put another way, a trial court may uphold a jury verdict resting on sufficiently weighty
11 evidence, even if the court itself might have reached a different conclusion. However, the trial
12 court must conduct its own independent evaluation of the evidence, including weighing the
13 evidence and judging the credibility of witnesses. *Id.*

14 In their combined Motion for New Trial, Johnson & Johnson and JJCI argue that the
15 verdict is against the weight of evidence. They contend the evidence presented was insufficient
16 to establish causation, and that mere possibility is insufficient to establish a prima face case.
(*Jones v. Ortho Pharm. Corp.* 163 Cal.App.3d at 402.)

17 As to general causation, defendants argue that:

18 (1) The epidemiology studies do not show a strong association between genital talc use
19 and ovarian cancer, noting that the epidemiology studies reveal average risk ratios of 1.24-1.3.
20 (Tr. 1398:23-1402:8, 2459:5-2461:13, 3700:10-3701:8.). This relatively weak association could
21 be the result of chance. (Tr. 1443:12-1444:19 (Exhibit L-1769); Tr. 2332:25-2345:18; 2430:12-
22 28; 2456:19-2458:4; 2448:14-2489:13; 3178:22-3180:20; 3361:21-3370:19; 3700:10-3705:4.)

23 (2) The results of studies are inconsistent. (Tr. 1426:2-15, Exhibit P-104, at 3; 1430:5-
24 1433:5; 3714:2-3716:28; 1433:25-1438:5; Exhibit L-1769 Tr. 3705:9-3707:19; 3176:14-3178:7;
25 3361:2-20; 3721:10-3723:5; 3603:12-3607:13.)

1 (3) The studies fail to establish a dose-response relationship. (Tr. 3723:19-3724:1;
2 2389:21-2394:1; 2383:10-2389:5; 2823:3-2824:9 (L-1811); 3182:14-3183:25; 3723:8-3736:2.)
3 Echeverria’s expert, Siemiatycki, testified that although a study by Terry (2013) showed
4 “compatibility” with dose response, it was equally compatible with no dose-response. (TR
5 2383:10-2389:5).

6 (4) No animal study has ever shown that talc causes ovarian cancer. (Tr. 3186:11-
7 3195:20 (Hamilton 1974); 1239:23-27; 1253:26-1255:2, 3186:11-3195:20 (Ex.P-47); 1270:19-
8 1276:28 (1995 Boorman).

9 (5) The proposed biological mechanism is speculative. (Tr. 3476:13-3480:23; 3492:20-
10 26; 3464:9-3465:23; 3475:23-3480:23; 3492:20-26; 3536:4-13; 3567:12-3568:6; 3601:12-
11 3602:1; 1359:3-10; 1363:12-19; 1383:3-9; 2483:11-2486:28; 1354:23-1357:9; Exhibit L-811;
12 Exhibit P-47 at 3-5.)

13 (6) The consensus view in the regulatory, scientific, and medical community is that the
14 science does not support a causal relationship. (Exhibit P-47; Exhibit P-29; Tr. 1196:7-23;
15 1198:8-12002:2; 2162:18-2163:10; 2282:5-2283:28; 2285:23-26; 2291:15-23; 1619:6-1620:8.)
16 Talc is not recognized as an ovarian cancer risk by the Centers for Disease Control or medical
17 associations such as the American Congress of Obstetrics and Gynecologists or Society of
18 Gynecological Oncology. (Tr. 2714:2-2721:9; 3580:9-3590:5.) No published peer-reviewed
19 articles declare talc to cause ovarian cancer. (Tr. 2276:21-2277:19; 2280:2-10; 3695:19-3696:7;
20 3749:12-3750:1.) The Clyde 2017 study, which was comprehensive, did not include talc as a risk
21 factor even though it was considered as part of its analysis. (Tr. 1448:26-1459:9.)

22 As to specific causation, Defendants argue Yessaian’s testimony was insufficient as a
23 matter of law to prove specific causation for the reasons set forth above regarding JNOV. They
24 further argue Yessaian’s testimony was speculative and unreliable, and her credibility was
25 undermined, because she focused only on studies that supported her conclusion while
disregarding any contradictory data or cohort studies, including more recent studies, and ignored
the studies she cited. They suggest “cherry-picking” metrics from different studies is not good
science. (Tr. 2428:16-26; *In re Zolofit (Sertaline Hydrochloride) Prod. Liab. Litig.* (E.D. Penn.

1 2014) 26 F.Supp.3d 449, 460-462.). In addition, even as to the four studies on which she relied
2 Yessaian used only data or metrics she considered helpful. Her report indicated she would apply
3 data based on Echeverria's estimated 30,000 lifetime genital applications of talc (Exhibit PP at
4 8), which would have produced a statistically insignificant relative risk ratio under the Wu 2009
5 study (Tr. 2908:6-2910:28). They argue that to find a "better" odds ratio Yessaian switched to a
6 different measure of use (years), which she had previously deemed less accurate. When
7 questioned about this at trial Yessaian testified that the category for 50,000 lifetime applications
8 applied to a combined genital and non-genital use, even though previously she testified that talc
9 could not reach the ovaries through non-genital applications. (Tr. 2802:8-12.)

10 In contrast to Yessaian's testimony, Defendants assert their experts provided persuasive
11 testimony that there was no inflammation in Echeverria's ovarian tissue, that most ovarian
12 cancers are idiopathic, and that Echeverria had multiple risk factors that could account for her
13 disease regardless of her talc use.

14 Echeverria asserts that sufficient evidence supporting the jury's verdict was presented,
15 Echeverria agrees that the evidence showed that the relative risk ratio suggested by the bulk of
16 the epidemiological studies was 1.3 (Tr. 2236:1-13, 3787:14-16.) She characterizes this number
17 as statistically significant because talc is a nongenotoxic carcinogen requiring a series of
18 mutational events to lead to ovarian cancer. (Tr. 1127:7-1128:15.) Echeverria argues based on
19 the 6 meta-analyses and the Terry pooled analysis, plus the consistency of the 28 epidemiology
20 studies, it is almost impossible that association is attributable to chance or bias. (Tr. 1563:5-18,
21 2314:1-20, 2236:1-13, 2249:7-14, Ex. 27 (P-47).)

22 Echeverria's opposition also argues that as to biological plausibility, she presented
23 evidence that inflammation is a valid hypothesis as to how talc causes cancer.

24 She notes that animal studies in 1992 by the NTP found lung cancer in rats exposed to
25 high levels of aerosolized talc.

26 Finally, repeating arguments made in opposition to the motion for JNOV, she argues that
27 since 1964 Defendants have been aware of "the talc/ovary problem" and yet failed to warn
28 (Opposition at 5:13-14) or donate to cancer research (Ex P-55).

1 Defendants respond that Echeverria's inflammation hypothesis is not supported by
2 studies and there was no evidence presented that the kind of inflammation specific to talc is
3 linked to cancer. As to Echeverria's argument that based on meta-analysis and the Terry study, it
4 is almost impossible that the 1.3 association is attributable to chance or bias, Defendants note that
5 Echeverria does not dispute that the association could be based on confounding, something her
6 own expert admits is not eliminated in meta-analysis. (Tr. 2430:12-25.)

7 Defendant also argues that the weight of evidence did not establish a duty to warn
8 because such a duty is only triggered when the prevailing scientific and medical knowledge
9 supports it. (*Valentine v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.* (1999) 68 Cal.App.4th 1467, 1483-84.)

10 Finally, defendants suggest the jury was likely confused by repeated suggestions that the
11 possibility of risk alone was sufficient to impose a duty to warn. (Tr. 656:15-689:27-691:19
12 (mistrial requested on argument in opening statement); 3997:19-3998:4; 4005:22-27 (closing
13 argument.)

14 Sitting as the thirteenth juror the Court is of the firm conclusion that the evidence of
15 specific causation is not sufficient to support the verdict, for the reasons set forth above
16 respecting the JNOV, which are incorporated here in their entirety, and for the additional reason
17 that Yessaian did not consider all available epidemiology and apply it to the facts relative to
18 Echeverria except when it favored Echeverria. There was a lack of any proper testimony as to
19 specific causation. In addition, and as to general causation, the Court respects the testimony of
20 Siemiatycki to the effect that there have been many instances in history where a disease agent
21 was identified notwithstanding that the exact mechanism by which the disease was caused was
22 not identified. Further, given the nature of inflammatory responses, it is understandable that
23 inflammation may not be easily shown, as Echeverria's experts testified. However, given the
24 lack of anything other than a hypothesis about causation and the nature of the epidemiological
25 evidence presented, defendants are entitled to a new trial pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §
657(6), as both specific and general causation evidence was lacking.

//

1 **(2) CCP §657(1) (7) - Erroneous Rulings and Improper Arguments**

2 In order to grant a new trial based on errors in law at trial, the error must have been
3 prejudicial (Cal. Const. Article VI, §13), and erroneous as a matter of law (*Tun v. Wells Fargo*
4 *Dealer Services, Inc.* (2016) 5 Cal.App.5th 309, 323). Additionally, the error must have been
5 raised at trial. In support of their motion defendants submitted the Declarations of Jurors 1 and
6 2. Echeverria countered with the Declarations of Jurors 8 and 10.

7
8 *1. Yessaian*

9 Defendants argue that Yessaian's testimony should have been excluded or stricken
10 because she relied on the false assumption that an odds ratio of 1.51 was sufficient to show
11 probability. Additionally, her testimony should have been stricken when she violated the Court's
12 order limiting it to the four epidemiology studies as her basis for ruling in talc as the cause of
13 Echeverria's cancer. They argue Yessaian violated that order by testifying that the four
14 epidemiological studies were not the sole studies she relied on (Tr. 2820:11-15; 2820:1-5), but
15 instead that she relied on other epidemiological studies with risk ratios of 1.2 to 1.3 which, in her
16 view, showed an increase in risk that supported finding talc the probable cause of Echeverria's
17 cancer. (Tr. 2820:26-28.) This was misleading because a risk ratio of less than 2.0 actually tends
18 to disprove causation. Defendants moved to strike this testimony but the Court denied the
19 motion. (Tr. 2940:1-2953:28.)

20 Echeverria contends these criticisms go to the weight, not admissibility of Yessaian's
21 testimony. In addition, they argue the Court indicated that Yessaian was not limited to the four
22 studies but could also testify as to Echeverria's medical history, general literature, and risk
23 factors that she ruled out, citing the ruling on the motion in limine. Echeverria argues there was
24 no showing of prejudice, noting that the juror declarations (which Echeverria argues should be
25 stricken) do not say the outcome would have been different without Yessaian's testimony.
Jurors 8 and 10 say they considered all the evidence and even Jurors 1 and 2 do not say the
outcome would have been different without Yessaian's testimony. Finally, Echeverria points out

1 that Defendants were free to, and did, criticize Yessaian's testimony by way of cross-
2 examination and in closing arguments. (Tr. 4060:22-4063:7.)

3 Echeverria is correct that in the absence of affidavits showing prejudice, the Court may
4 not grant a new trial under Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §657(1). See Cal. Code of Civ. Pro §658.
5 Accordingly, the motion for new trial on this ground is denied.

6 However, for the reasons set forth above the Court is persuaded that the testimony of
7 Yessaian was insufficient to establish specific causation and should therefore have been stricken.
8 The motion is granted on this basis under Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §657(7) as to both defendants.

9 2. CACI 431

10 The Court relied upon *Cooper v. Takeda Pharmaceuticals America, Inc.* (2015) 239 Cal.
11 App. 4th 555 in instructing under CACI 431 (multiple causation), although it indicated that it had
12 some doubt this was appropriate. “[W]hen deciding whether an error of instructional omission
13 was prejudicial, the court must also evaluate (1) the state of the evidence, (2) the effect of other
14 instruction, (3) the effect of counsel's arguments, and (4) any indications by the jury itself that it
15 was misled.” (*Soule v. General Motors Corp.* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 548, 580-581.)

16 Defendants argue that, unlike in *Cooper*, there was no factual basis to instruct on CACI
17 431 because Echeverria did not present evidence of any specific concurrent cause. Here,
18 Yessaian did not rule in other causes while opining that talc was the most substantial factor. (Tr.
19 2676:1-3, 2929:21-2930:7; 2931:4-14.)

20 Defendants argue given the Court's rulings that Yessaian was precluded from testifying
21 as to a possible “synergistic effect” that cause Echeverria's cancer, the fact that neither Godleski
22 nor Yessaian testified to the biological plausibility of combined concurring causes, and the fact
23 that defense expert Juan Felix, M.D. testified without contradiction that talc-based adhesions
24 would not promote the growth of existing ovarian cancer (Tr. 3535:8-16), there was no basis for
25 a multiple cause instruction. They contend giving the instruction likely prejudiced the results by
diluting Echeverria's burden to show that talc was the “but for” cause. Defendants argue that at a
critical point in deliberations, the jury discussed multiple causation (Juror #1 Declaration, ¶¶ 2-

1 3), making it reasonably probable the jury would have reached a different result if properly
2 instructed.

3 Echeverria argues that on cross-examination, Yessaian testified to Echeverria's family
4 history of cancer, obesity, smoking, age, age at menarche, and genetics as possible factors in
5 causing her cancer. (Tr. 2118:18-2119:9; 2869:15-2870:27; 2875:4-10; 2876:1-14; 3597:5-15.)
6 But, she also testified that as to each factor she determined that it was not a "probable" cause of
7 Echeverria's cancer. It is also true, however, that defendants argued to the jury there could be
8 other causes for Echeverria's cancer, including unknown causes.

9 There are no admissible juror affidavits that suggest prejudice, confusion or the like.
10 Thus, the motion cannot be granted under Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §657(1). As to whether there
11 was error of law the Court notes, as it did at trial, that in a case involving whether an agent
12 causes cancer, where it must be shown by a more probable than not standard (in excess of 50%)
13 that the agent caused the disease, CACI 431 is inherently confusing because, by definition,
14 alternate "causes" must be less than 50% probable. That is, there cannot be more than one
15 "probable" cause in a cancer case as a mathematical matter. Nonetheless, given defendants'
16 arguments that alternate unknown causes were possible causes of Echeverria's cancer, the Court
17 is bound by *Cooper* and denies the motion on the basis of improper instruction under Cal. Code
18 of Civ. Pro. § 657(7).

19 3. Condom Article—Ex. 19

20 Defendants argue that the Court improperly allowed Exhibit P-19 to be shown to the jury.
21 The article asserts that concern about talc as an ovarian carcinogen in the medical literature goes
22 back 50 years and that condom makers removed talc from condoms in the 1990s for that reason.
23 Defendants argue that the Court struck Echeverria's attempt to introduce the article through
24 Plunkett's testimony and then improperly allowed it to be introduced through defendants' expert
25 (Andersen) even though the condom article was not part of the testimony Plunkett actually gave
at trial and was only reviewed by Andersen as part of his consideration of Plunkett's testimony
and report. (Tr. 3395:9-3396:18.) Echeverria did not ask Andersen anything about the article

1 other than whether he had seen it. (Tr. 3397:7-22.) Although the Court gave a limiting
2 instruction, Echeverria's counsel referred to it several times in closing argument. (Tr. 3928:10-
3 21; 3947:21-3948:1; 3948:4-9; 3950:14-15; 3995:25-26; 4003:3-6), stating to the jury that
4 "concern about talc as an ovarian carcinogen goes back 50 years in the medical literature" (Tr.
5 3947: 22-248) and arguing that the condom industry removed talc from condoms in 1996
6 because of ovarian cancer concerns (Tr. 3950: 14-16).

7 Echeverria contends there was nothing wrong with permitting cross-examination of
8 Andersen about the article (since he said he relied on it in forming his opinion) (Tr. 3395:9-
9 3396:18; 3396:16-22), or about allowing Echeverria's counsel to refer to it in closing arguments.
10 Further, the Court gave a limiting instruction that it was not admissible for its truth but only for
11 purposes of notice. (Tr. 3928:4-21.)

12 The Court concurs that Ex. 19 should not have been admitted and counsel's reference to
13 it was both prejudicial and undermined the limiting instruction. The Supreme Court held in
14 *People v. Sanchez* (2016) 63 Cal. 4th 665 that an expert may not testify as to case specific
15 hearsay or use same as the basis for his opinion without establishing an applicable hearsay
16 exception. The reasoning behind the opinion was the Court's recognition, among other things,
17 that "[w]hen an expert relies on hearsay to provide case-specific facts, considers the statements
18 as true, and relates them to the jury as a reliable basis for the expert's opinion, it cannot logically
19 be asserted that the hearsay content is not offered for its truth. In such a case, 'the validity of [the
20 expert's] opinion ultimately turn[s] on the truth.'" (Id. at 682-683, quoting *Williams v Villinos*
21 (2012) 567 U.S. 90). The court disapproved the use of a limiting instruction in these
22 circumstances.

23 Here, the only evidence was that Andersen read the newspaper article because it was
24 attached to Plunkett's report and was the basis of *her* opinion. Contrary to the representation of
25 counsel that he would "link up" the article to his cross examination of Andersen as to the basis of
Andersen's opinion, he did not do so but simply read it into the record and then proceeded to
argue to the jury that the facts contained within it were true. This resulted in a situation akin to

1 what *Sanchez* sought to avoid—having the jury receive a fact as true through expert testimony
2 when the fact as not been established in any reliable way. And, repeated references to it were
3 clearly prejudicial as it was a key piece of evidence that Echeverria’s counsel (Mr. Smith) relied
4 upon in arguing that defendants knew or should have known that talc caused cancer and failed to
5 warn of the risks in derogation of safety to the public.

6 Together with the other evidentiary failures a new trial on this basis is proper as to both
7 defendants under Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. § 657(7).

8 9 4. *Lobbying*

10 Defendants argue that Echeverria’s counsel disregarded limitations on use of lobbying
11 evidence. After rejecting Echeverria’s theory of conspiracy to influence regulatory agencies, (Tr.
12 1487:10-1488:5), the Court allowed in certain documents about attempts to influence NTP or
13 IARC. (Ex. P-27, P-263, P-264, P-396) for the limited purpose of showing Defendant’s
14 knowledge that talc was being considered a carcinogen. (Tr. 3933:13-21.) Defense counsel
15 objected to various lobbying exhibits and moved for a mistrial after Echeverria’s counsel argued
16 about lobbying in opening statement. (Tr. 691:20-693:1.)

17 Defendants contend Echeverria’s counsel disregarded the limiting instruction, and this
18 conduct was repeated and unmistakably intentional. (Tr. 3982:25-3981:1; 4094:1-8; 4094:10-14;
19 4090:5-11; 4093:27-28; 3989:24-3991:18; 3984:17-18; 4002:27-4003:2; 3318:20-28; 670:2-15;
20 3978:4-8; 4083:3-16.)

21 Echeverria takes the position that there was nothing improper about referring to lobbying
22 evidence in closing argument. Echeverria argues that counsel are entitled to state their views as
23 to what the evidence shows, citing Wegner, Civil Trials and Evidence (2017) at 13:42. Further,
24 the Court gave a limiting instruction. (Tr. 39906:9-3908:23), while allowing the jury to consider
25 evidence of lobbying to show knowledge of the danger of the product. (Tr. 3933:13-28; 4000:21-
4001:3.)

1 While counsel are entitled to argue the evidence, they must do so consistent with a
2 limiting instruction. (*Love v. Wolf* (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 378, 389.) Echeverria's counsel did
3 not limit his argument to suggesting that the lobbying evidence suggested that defendants knew
4 that there was scientific evidence concerning the possible link between talc and ovarian cancer.
5 Rather, Echeverria's counsel (Mr. Smith) argued that defendants improperly "fended off" the
6 NTP and stated that "if Johnson & Johnson would have just stayed out of it, let the scientists do
7 their work at the U.S. government, the NTP would have listed talc as a carcinogen as far back as
8 2000. (TR 3982:25-3984:1.) Counsel went on to argue that what defendants did to "prevent
9 regulation" was reprehensible conduct supporting an award of punitive damages. (TR 3984:17-
10 18.)

11 Although the jury was instructed that lobbying activity was permissible, the totality of
12 this argument disregarded the Court's limiting instruction and must be viewed as prejudicial and
13 further grounds for a new trial as to both defendants under Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. Code of Civ.
14 Pro. §657(7).

15 **(3) Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. § 657(2) --Jury Misconduct**

16 Defendants argue that the jury engaged in misconduct by considering attorneys' fees and
17 taxes in its compensatory award and by setting the amount of compensatory damages based on
18 the net worth of the defendants. Defendants offer the declaration of Juror #1 (M.M, the
19 foreperson) and Juror #2 (J.D.H.) Echeverria offers the affidavits of Juror #8 (P.C.) and Juror
20 #10 (N.F.).

21 The three-step inquiry into jury misconduct includes (1) whether the affidavits supporting
22 the motion are admissible, (2) whether the facts establish misconduct, and (3) if so, whether it
23 was prejudicial. (*Whitlock v. Foster Wheeler, LLC* (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 149, 160.)

24 Under California law juror affidavits attesting to the jury's "mental processes" are
25 prohibited. However, consideration of "statements made" or "conduct occurring" during

1 deliberations is permissible. (Cal. Ev. Code § 1150; *Krouse v. Graham* (1977) 19 Cal.3d 59, 80;
2 *In re Stankewitz* (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 391, 397-402.)

3 Defendants argue that the jury engaged in two forms of misconduct.

4 First, the jury improperly considering attorney fees, appellate costs and taxes in
5 determining Echeverria's noneconomic damages. (Declaration of Juror No. 1, ¶4; Declaration of
6 Juror No. 2, ¶6.) Echeverria argues this evidence should be disregarded because it is hearsay and
7 goes to the jury's mental process. She also argues that the conduct does not amount to
8 misconduct in any event because Jurors 8 and 10 disagree. Finally, Echeverria argues that if
9 there was misconduct, it was not prejudicial because Jurors 1 and 2 at most say they did not
10 participate in the deliberations regarding damages; Defendants have not shown that absent the
11 alleged misconduct a different result would have been reached. Defendants argue in Reply that
12 the declarations provide clear testimony that jurors discussed and agreed to base compensatory
13 damages on attorneys' fees, appellate costs, taxes, and Defendants' wealth, which establishes
14 prejudicial misconduct.

15 The evidence in the jury declarations is mixed as to its admissibility. Specific rulings on
16 the objections are appended. Briefly, however, the statements by Jurors 1 and 2 that "[Jurors]
17 stated that taxes, appeal costs and expenses would be taken out of Ms. Echeverria's
18 compensation" and "After jurors raised these arguments, other jurors expressed an agreement to
19 raise the amount of damages" are admissible. The statements are proof of an overt act (an
20 agreement to raise damages based on impermissible considerations). They are not hearsay. The
21 statements are not admitted to show they are true (that Echeverria would pay fees and taxes) but
22 to show the statement was made. As the Supreme Court explained in *Weathers v. Kaiser Found.*
23 *Hospitals*: "hearsay is defined as 'evidence of a statement that was made other than by a witness
24 while testifying at the hearing and *that is offered to prove the truth of the matter stated.*'" (Evid.
25 Code, § 1200, subd. (a).) (Italics added.) However 'there is a well-established exception or
departure from the hearsay rule applying to cases in which the very fact in controversy is
whether certain things were said . . . and not . . . whether these things were true or false, and in
these cases the words... are admissible not as hearsay, but as original evidence.'" (*Weathers v.*

1 *Kaiser Found. Hosps.*, (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 98, 109-110, citing *People v. Henry* (1948) 86
2 Cal.App.2d 785, 789. See also *Enyart v. City of Los Angeles*, 76 Cal. App. 4th 499, 508, n. 5
3 [Statements reflecting on the bias of the jurors who uttered them are not hearsay]).

4 Although Echeverria secured juror declarations they did not refute what Jurors 1 and 2
5 reported. An agreement to exclude improper items of compensation such as taxes and fees in a
6 verdict is improper, particularly where the jury was instructed as to what they could consider.
7 (*Krouse*, 19 Cal. 3d at 80-81; *Trammell v. McDonnell Douglas* (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 157,
8 172). On the evidence here the Court is constrained to conclude that consideration of items of
9 damages such as taxes and fees was serious misconduct, giving rise to a presumption of
10 prejudice. No rebuttable evidence was offered. A new trial on this basis is thus required as to
11 both defendants under Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. § 657(2), particularly given that this was a 9-3
12 verdict. (*Weathers v. Kaiser*, 5 Cal. 3d at 110.)

13 Defendants also argue that the jury improperly based compensatory damages on
14 Defendants' wealth and apportioned the damages according to net worth. The jury awarded \$68
15 million in noneconomic damages against Johnson & Johnson as compared to the company's \$68
16 billion net worth, and \$2 million against JJCI as compared to its \$2 billion net worth. While it
17 may be inferred that the verdict was the result of consideration of wealth, statements regarding
18 the manner in which the jury deliberated are inadmissible. A new trial cannot be granted on this
19 basis.

20 **(4) Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §657(5) – Excessive Damages**

21 **(i) Compensatory Damages**

22 Defendants argue the compensatory damage award is excessive on its face, and grossly
23 disproportionate to the verdicts in prior talc-cancer cases and similar cases where plaintiff
24 established that he or she was diagnosed with terminal cancer caused by defendant's product.
25 Defendants contend this is due to improper arguments by Echeverria's counsel.

1 The evidence was that Echeverria was diagnosed with cancer in 2007. She underwent
2 surgery and multiple rounds of chemotherapy, including clinical trials, and endured their side
3 effects, for ten years. She testified that she has pain from tumors that have developed since her
4 surgery. (Tr. 3010:1-3011:3; Tr. 2574: 26-2577: 28; 3008:22-3009:17.) She testified that she
5 feared death when she became ill in late 2016 and was hospitalized with sepsis. (Tr. 2998:28-
6 2999:2.) She testified to her fears and to the impact that her illness has had on her family,
7 particularly her daughter, who took on the responsibility for her care at age 16 and delayed
8 graduation from high school as a result, as well as her sadness at the potential of losing her
9 relationship with her young grandson. (Tr. 3011: 4-19.) Yessaian testified that Echeverria had
10 complications from the chemotherapy, resulting in multiple hospitalizations. She also testified
11 that for a woman of Echeverria's age the average life expectancy is 81 years. (Tr. 2683:23-28.)

12 Given this testimony the Court is not persuaded that the compensatory damages against
13 JCCI (\$2 million) can be deemed excessive if liability were established. The number is well in
14 line with other verdicts in comparable cases. Accordingly, as to JCCI the motion for new trial on
15 grounds of excessive damages is denied.

16 As to Johnson & Johnson, however, the court is convinced that the jury should have
17 reached a different verdict. The compensatory verdict (\$68 million) is plainly excessive. As
18 found, *infra*, there is no evidence Johnson & Johnson manufactured baby powder after 1967 and
19 there is no evidence it manufactured Shower to Shower. Yet, the jury apportioned the damages
20 97% to Johnson & Johnson. Given the misconduct of the jury in considering matters that were
21 not to be included, and the arguments of counsel that were in violation of the Court's in limine
22 motions, and given the other reasons why a new trial is required, a remittitur is not appropriate.
23 A new trial is required on the basis of excessive noneconomic damages is granted as to Johnson
24 & Johnson under Cal. Code. of Civ. Pro. § 657(5).

25
(ii) Punitive Damages

Defendants argue that the punitive damage award is against the weight of evidence and
excessive. Defendants contend Echeverria failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence
that Defendants acted with malice. Even if allowed, Defendants contend the Court should reduce

1 the damages as excessive and the product of passion and prejudice, driven by improper
2 arguments seeking to punish Defendants for protected First Amendment activity and in violation
3 of due process. *BMW of North America v. Gore* (1996) 517 U.S. 559, 574-575 indicates that
4 punitive damages are to be reviewed based on (1) the degree of reprehensibility, (2) the disparity
5 between the actual or potential harm suffered by the plaintiff and the punitive damage award, and
6 (3) a comparison to civil penalties in comparable cases. Focusing on the second factor,
7 Defendants cites case law showing historical practice is to compare the ratio of punitive to
8 compensatory damages, and, although bright-line rules are to be eschewed, awards of more than
9 four times the amount of compensatory damages, “might be close to the line of constitutional
10 impropriety” (*State Farm Mutual Auto Ins. Co. v. Campbell* (2003) 538 U.S. 408, 425), but
11 where compensatory damages are substantial, a lesser ratio (1:1) can reach the due process limit.
12 (Ibid.) Ratios of 9:1 are inherently suspect. (*Simon v. San Paolo U.S. Holding Co.* (2005) 35
13 Cal.4th 1159, 1182.) Echeverria points out that the 5:1 ratio here is well within the limits that
14 have consistently been upheld but does not identify a case upholding a very significant punitive
15 damages award layered on top of a substantial compensatory damage award.

16 It is sufficient to state for these purposes that the evidence was insufficient to uphold a
17 punitive damage award of any kind. Analysis of what constitutes a “proper” amount of punitive
18 damages is thus unnecessary. The punitive damages were excessive based on the evidence. A
19 new trial is required as to both defendants under Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. § 657(5).

20 **V. ORDER**


21 For the foregoing reasons:

- 22 (1) The motions for JNOV by Johnson & Johnson and JCCI are granted;
- 23 (2) The motions for new trial by Johnson & Johnson and JCCI on grounds of (1)
24 insufficiency of the evidence as to causation as to both defendants (Cal. Code of Civ.
25 Pro. 657(6)); (2) error in law occurring at trial and excepted to by defendants (Cal.
Code of Civ. Pro. 657(7)); (3) misconduct of the jury (Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. 657(2));

1 Civ. Pro. 657(2); and (4) excessive compensatory damages (as to Johnson & Johnson)
2 and excessive punitive damages (as to both defendants)(Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. 657(5))
3 are granted.

4 Dated:

10/20/17



MAREN E. NELSON

Judge of the Superior Court

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PLEADINGS CONSIDERED

Filed September 5, 2017

- Defendant Johnson & Johnson's Notice of Intention to Move for a New Trial
- Defendant Johnson & Johnson's Notice of Motion for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict
- Defendant Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc.'s Notice of Motion for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict

Filed September 15, 2017

- Defendants' Motion for New Trial (Combined Memorandum of Points and Authorities)
 - Defendants' Compendium of Trial Transcripts (Volumes I and II)
 - Declaration of Bart H. Williams in Support of Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc.'s Motions for New Trial and Motions for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict
 - Notice of Lodging Exhibits G and L to the Williams Declaration Conditionally Under Seal
 - Notice of Lodging Exhibits F, H, I, O, P, T, U, V, W, W and Y to the Williams Declaration Conditionally Under Seal
 - Declaration of Juror Number 1
 - Declaration of Juror Number 2

Filed September 25, 2017

- Plaintiff Eva Echeverria's Opposition to the Johnson & Johnson Defendants' Motion for New Trial
- Plaintiff Eva Echeverria's Opposition to Defendant Johnson & Johnson's Motion for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict
- Plaintiff Eva Echeverria's Opposition to Defendant Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc.'s Motion for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict
 - Declaration of Mark P. Robinson, Jr. (Under Seal and Redacted Versions)
 - Plaintiff Eva Echeverria's Compendium of Trial Transcript Excerpts
 - Evidentiary Objections to Declarations of Juror No. 1 and Juror No. 2
 - Request by Plaintiff and Motion to Strike Declarations of Juror Nos. 1 and 2 Submitted by Defendants
 - Affidavit of Juror Number 8 (P.C.)
 - Affidavit of Juror Number 10 (N.F.)

Filed October 3, 2017

- Defendants' Reply in Support of Motions for New Trial
 - Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Request to Strike and Evidentiary Objections re Juror Declarations Submitted in Support of Motion for New Trial
 - Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Juror Affidavits re Defendants' Motions for New Trial
 - Defendants' Supplemental Compendium of Trial Transcript Excerpts
- Defendant Johnson & Johnson Consumer, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict

- 1
- Defendant Johnson & Johnson's Reply in Support of Motion for Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict

2 Filed October 13, 2017

- 3
- Plaintiff's Supplemental Brief re Court's Questions at Hearing on Post-Trial Motions

4 Filed October 16, 2017

- 5
- Defendants' response to Plaintiff's Supplemental Post-Hearing Brief
-
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

1 **II. EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF JUROR NO. 1 (M.M.)**

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>3 "3. There were extensive</p> <p>4 <i>discussions</i> among the jurors</p> <p>5 about the distinction between</p> <p>6 'possible' and 'probable'</p> <p>7 causes. I raised that distinction</p> <p>8 several times. At one point</p> <p>9 while we were <i>discussing</i> this</p> <p>10 issue, one of the jurors <i>raised</i></p> <p>11 and pointed to the jury</p> <p>12 instruction on 'Multiple</p> <p>13 Causes,' which said in effect</p> <p>14 that there could be more than</p> <p>15 one substantial cause. After</p> <p>16 that, jurors in favor of the</p> <p>17 plaintiff <i>relied heavily</i> on that</p> <p>18 instruction in their arguments to</p> <p>19 other jurors." Juror No. 1</p> <p>20 Decl., at ¶ 3 (italics added).</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150.</p> <p>The statements in paragraph 3 of Juror No. 1's declaration concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. Such statements are inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150 and cannot be used to try to impeach the verdict. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>; Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, at § 2.27. "When a juror . . . gives the reasons for his or her vote, the words are a verbal reflection of the juror's mental processes, and consideration of such a statement as evidence of those processes is barred by Evid. Code § 1150." <i>Id.</i></p> <p>Hearsay. Juror No. 1's statements about what other (unidentified) jurors discussed or raised verbally is inadmissible hearsay.</p> <p>Speculation. Juror No.1's statement about what he thinks other jurors thought was important or what they "relied heavily on" is speculation, lacks foundation and personal knowledge as to the thinking and decision-making of other jurors.</p> <p>Lacks foundation, lacks detail, and conclusory.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><i>no to what the jurors relied on.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

654

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>503 1 "4. When discussing non 2 economic damages, jurors 3 initially <i>discussed</i> an amount 4 much lower than what was 5 ultimately awarded. Jurors 6 who voted in favor of liability 7 <i>argued</i> that there was going to 8 be an appeal process and that 9 the plaintiff's lawyers needed 10 to be paid and were going to 11 take much of the money. They 12 also <i>stated</i> that taxes, appeal 13 costs, and expenses would be 14 taken out of Ms. Echeverria's 15 compensation or out of the 16 money received by Ms. 17 Echeverria's daughter when 18 Ms. Echeverria passed away. 19 After jurors <i>raised</i> those 20 <i>arguments</i>, other jurors 21 <i>expressed</i> an agreement to raise 22 the amount of the damages." 23 Juror No. 1 Decl., at ¶ 4 (italics 24 added).</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150. The statements in paragraph 4 of Juror No. 1's declaration concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. The statements are inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150 and cannot be used to try to impeach the verdict. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>; Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, at § 2.27. "Juror declarations that purport to show a deliberative error by one or more jurors are inadmissible to impeach the verdict, as are juror declarations that purport to show . . . [h]ow the jurors arrived at the award of damages." Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, at § 2.29 (citing <i>Maxwell v.</i> <i>Powers</i> (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 1596, 1604-05). Hearsay. Juror No. 1's statements about other (unidentified) jurors' "discussions," their "arguments" or what they "argued," what they "stated," what they "expressed," or "raised" verbally is inadmissible hearsay. Lacks foundation, lacks detail, and conclusory. Neither the substance of any such statements by others nor their identity is provided. The statements are vague and conclusory.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled <i>as to They also stated... damages"</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled </p>

755

Sustained

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>1 “5. At the beginning when</p> <p>2 the jury first turned to</p> <p>3 discussing damages, one of the</p> <p>4 jurors who favored the plaintiff</p> <p>5 expressed that jurors who were</p> <p>6 in favor of the defense should</p> <p>7 not participate in the</p> <p>8 discussion. The jury took a poll</p> <p>9 on the issue of whether defense</p> <p>10 jurors should participate in the</p> <p>11 damages discussion. After the</p> <p>12 vote, although I (as the</p> <p>13 foreperson) facilitated the</p> <p>14 damages discussion by calling</p> <p>15 on jurors on writing things on</p> <p>16 the board, I did not express my</p> <p>17 views on the amount of</p> <p>18 compensatory damages. The</p> <p>19 other two defense jurors did not</p> <p>20 participate in the discussion of</p> <p>21 compensatory damages after</p> <p>22 the poll was taken regarding</p> <p>23 their participation.” Juror No. 1</p> <p>24 Decl., at ¶ 5 (italics added).</p> <p>25</p> <p>26</p> <p>27</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150.</p> <p>The statements in paragraph 5 of Juror No. 1’s declaration concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. Such statements are inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150 and cannot be used to try to impeach the verdict. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>. “No evidence is admissible to show the effect (of improper influences) upon a juror in influencing him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or concerning the mental processes by which it was determined.” Evid. Code 1150(a) (emphasis added).</p> <p>Hearsay. Juror No. 1’s statements about what one or more jurors (unidentified by name or juror number) supposedly said, discussed or expressed is inadmissible hearsay.</p> <p>Lacks foundation, lacks detail, and conclusory. Juror No. 1 does not have personal knowledge regarding the extent of participation of other jurors in discussions in the deliberation process.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p>as to</p> <p>“The jury”</p> <p>Participation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>1 Material Objected to:</p> <p>2 “When deciding how to</p> <p>3 apportion damages between the</p> <p>4 two defendants, the only thing</p> <p>5 the jury <i>discussed</i> as the basis</p> <p>6 for the division was the relative</p> <p>7 net worth of the two companies.</p> <p>8 Jurors <i>agreed</i> to assess a larger</p> <p>9 amount for non-economic</p> <p>10 damages from the parent</p> <p>11 company (Johnson & Johnson)</p> <p>12 because of the ratio between the</p> <p>13 net worth of Johnson &</p> <p>14 Johnson and that of JJCI.”</p> <p>15 Juror No. 1 Decl., at ¶ 6 (italics</p> <p>16 added).</p>	<p>2 Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150.</p> <p>3 The statements in paragraph 6 of Juror No. 1’s</p> <p>4 declaration concern the mental processes,</p> <p>5 deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of</p> <p>6 the jury regarding how the verdict was reached.</p> <p>7 These statements are inadmissible pursuant to</p> <p>8 Evid. Code § 1150 and cannot be used to try to</p> <p>9 impeach the verdict. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a);</p> <p>10 <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>; Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ.</p> <p>11 Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, at § 2.27. “Juror</p> <p>12 declarations that purport to show a deliberative</p> <p>13 error by one or more jurors are inadmissible to</p> <p>14 impeach the verdict, as are juror declarations that</p> <p>15 purport to show . . . [h]ow the jurors arrived at the</p> <p>16 award of damages.” <i>Id.</i> at § 2.29 (citing <i>Maxwell</i></p> <p>17 <i>v. Powers</i> (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 1596, 1604-05).</p> <p>18 Hearsay. Juror No. 1’s statements about what</p> <p>19 other (unidentified) jurors “discussed” or</p> <p>20 “agreed” regarding their decision-making process</p> <p>21 in awarding damages is inadmissible hearsay.</p> <p>22 Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks personal</p> <p>23 knowledge, conclusory. In paragraph 5, Juror</p> <p>24 No. 1 said that he and the other “defense jurors”</p> <p>25 did not participate in the damages discussion. If</p> <p>26 that was true, it would mean that he lacks</p> <p>27 foundation and personal knowledge to state why</p> <p>28 or how other jurors “agreed” to assess damages.</p>	<p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p>3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p>4 • Jurors agreed</p> <p>5 J J C I</p> <p>18 <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p>19 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p>22 <input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p>23 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

SUSH

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>2 §. "When the jury was 3 discussing the amount of 4 punitive damages, the jurors 5 who voted in favor of liability 6 discussed and agreed to set the 7 number based on a percentage 8 of the Defendants' net worth, as 9 Allen Smith had argued in 10 closing argument." Juror No. 1 11 Decl., at ¶ 7 (italics added).</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150. The statements in paragraph 7 concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. Such statements are inadmissible. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>; Statements in "juror declarations that purport to show . . . [h]ow the jurors arrived at the award of damages" are inadmissible. Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, § 2.29.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled <i>in the jurors agreed... argument</i></p>
	<p>Hearsay. Juror No. 1's statements about what other (unidentified) jurors "discussed" or "agreed" regarding their decision-making process in awarding damages is inadmissible hearsay.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
	<p>Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks personal knowledge. Juror No. 1 lacks personal knowledge and his statements lack foundation as to what other jurors discussed or how or why they decided or "agreed" to award damages.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
	<p>Not relevant. Evid. Code § 350. It is not misconduct to consider the defendant's net worth in awarding punitive damages. CACI 3945. <i>See also</i> Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, § 2.53 ("[P]unitive damages must be supported by . . . evidence of the defendant's financial condition" and "the defendant's net worth is the critical determinant.").</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

1058

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>1 "8. When the jury was at a 2 six-to-six impasse on the Friday 3 before the verdict, one plaintiff 4 juror <i>expressed</i> that she no 5 longer wanted to participate. 6 She even turned her chair away 7 from the table. I wrote a note to 8 the Court about the impasse. 9 After we received a note back 10 from the Court, we continued to 11 deliberate, but the jury 12 continued to be divided and 13 could not reach the nine votes 14 necessary to reach a verdict. 15 The same juror <i>told</i> me that she 16 was going to write to the judge 17 and ask to be taken off the jury 18 because of her frustration. She 19 began writing a letter in front of 20 the other jurors." Juror No. 1 21 Decl., at ¶ 8 (<i>italics added</i>).</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150. The statements in paragraph 8 concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. The statements are inadmissible. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>. "No evidence is admissible to show the effect (of improper influences) upon a juror in influencing him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or concerning the mental processes by which it was determined." Evid. Code § 1150(a).</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
	<p>Hearsay. Juror No. 1's statements about what some other (unidentified) juror "expressed" or "told" him or said she was going to "ask" is inadmissible hearsay.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
	<p>Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks personal knowledge. Juror No. 1's statements regarding why he thinks some other juror (who is not even identified) was frustrated is speculation and lacks foundation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
	<p>Not relevant. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 350. The fact that one juror at one point in time was frustrated or supposedly said that she was going to write a letter to the judge is not relevant. The statements do not show misconduct, that the juror refused to continue to deliberate or did anything improper.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>1 “9. After the jury received 2 the note from the Court in 3 response to the jury note, one of 4 the plaintiff jurors <i>argued</i> 5 vociferously that the jury was 6 being <i>told</i> it needed to reach a 7 verdict. At that point, the jury 8 took a vote using a one to ten 9 scale to indicate how strongly 10 we favored a given side (‘1’ 11 being strongest for defense, and 12 ‘10’ being strongest for 13 plaintiff). Using that 14 methodology, the ‘average’ 15 was about a ‘7,’ even though 16 the jury remained divided. The 17 jury continued to deliberate 18 through the end of the day on 19 Friday.” Juror No. 1 Decl., at ¶ 20 9 (<i>italics added</i>).</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150. The statements in paragraph 9 are inadmissible because they concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>. “‘Evidence about a jury’s ‘subjective collective mental process purporting to show how the verdict was reached’ is inadmissible.” <i>English v. Lin</i> (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 1187, 1367.</p> <p>Hearsay. The statements about what some other jurors “argued” regarding what they were “told,” and methodology referenced is hearsay.</p> <p>Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks personal knowledge, lacks detail, conclusory. Juror No. 1’s statements about what he recalls the overall “average” numbers referenced in the methodology being “about” for the other jurors is speculation, lack foundation, lack detail, and are vague and impermissible conclusions.</p> <p>Not relevant. Jurors can consider the evidence and “express opinions regarding it.” <i>People v. Steele</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1230, 1266. There is nothing wrong with “jurors employ[ing] their own reasoning skills in a demonstrative manner . . . to the evidence admitted at trial.” <i>People v. Vigil</i> (2011) 191 Cal.App.4th 1474, 1485.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

1260

1 **III. EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF JUROR NO. 2 (J.D.H.)**

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>3 “2. On Friday August 18, 4 2017, the jury was split 6 to 6. 5 Our foreperson sent a note to 6 the Judge telling her that the 7 jury could not reach a verdict. 8 One plaintiff juror <i>said</i> she no 9 longer wanted to participate in 10 discussions. She turned her 11 chair away from the table and 12 began writing something. After 13 we received the note from the 14 Judge and were still not able to 15 reach a verdict, someone <i>said</i> 16 we should just tell the Judge 17 that we are a hung jury. At that 18 point, one of the jurors angrily 19 <i>said</i> that the note we received 20 from the Judge said we had no 21 choice but to reach a verdict.” 22 Juror No. 2 Decl., at ¶ 2 (italics 23 added).</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150. The statements in paragraph 2 concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. Such statements are inadmissible. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>. “No evidence is admissible to show the effect (of improper influences) upon a juror in influencing him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or concerning the mental processes by which it was determined.” Evid. Code § 1150(a). Hearsay. Juror No. 2’s statements about what some other juror (unidentified by name, juror number or even gender) supposedly said or meant is inadmissible hearsay. Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks personal knowledge, lacks detail, and conclusory. Juror No. 2’s statements are vague, lack foundation, are speculative, conclusory and lack sufficient detail. Not relevant. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 350. The fact that one juror at one point in time may have been frustrated or supposedly said that she was going to write a letter to the judge is not relevant. The statements do not show misconduct, that deliberations did not continue, or anyone did anything improper.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

24
25
26
27
28
J 61

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>1 “3. We were not able to</p> <p>2 reach a verdict on Friday</p> <p>3 August 18. My best memory is</p> <p>4 that the jury was still divided 7</p> <p>5 to 5 in favor of the plaintiff at</p> <p>6 the end of the day.” Juror No. 2</p> <p>7 Decl., at ¶ 3.</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>26</p> <p>27</p> <p>28</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150.</p> <p>The statements in paragraph 3 concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. The statements are inadmissible. See Evid. Code § 1150(a); see also § I.A. <i>supra</i>. “No evidence is admissible to show the effect (of improper influences) upon a juror in influencing him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or concerning the mental processes by which it was determined.” Evid. Code § 1150(a). “Evidence Code 1150 may be violated not only by the admission of jurors’ testimony describing their own mental processes, but also by permitting testimony concerning statements made by jurors in the course of their deliberations.” <i>People v. Sanchez</i> (1998) 62 Cal.App.4th 460, 475-76. “[T]he mental processes of jurors are beyond the hindsight probing of the trial court.” <i>Maple v. Cincinatti, Inc.</i> (1985) 163 Cal.App.3d 387, 394. The rule prevents one or two jurors “from upsetting a verdict of the whole jury by impugning his own or his fellow jurors’ mental process or reasons for assent or dissent.” <i>Wegner</i>, at ¶ 18:288.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

162

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>1 4. "On Monday August</p> <p>2 21, 2017, after almost no</p> <p>3 discussion, two more jurors</p> <p>4 switched to the plaintiff side,</p> <p>5 giving the plaintiff 9 votes."</p> <p>6 Juror No. 2 Decl., at ¶ 4.</p>	<p>7 Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150.</p> <p>8 The statements in paragraph 4 concern the mental</p> <p>9 processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective</p> <p>10 reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict</p> <p>11 was reached. Such statements are inadmissible.</p> <p>12 Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>.</p> <p>13 "No evidence is admissible to show the effect (of</p> <p>14 improper influences) upon a juror in influencing</p> <p>15 him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or</p> <p>16 concerning the mental processes by which it was</p> <p>17 determined." Evid. Code § 1150(a). "Evidence</p> <p>18 about a jury's 'subjective collective mental</p> <p>19 process purporting to show how the verdict was</p> <p>20 reached' is inadmissible to impeach a jury</p> <p>21 verdict." <i>English v. Lin</i> (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th</p> <p>22 1187, 1367. "[T]he mental processes of jurors" is</p> <p>23 not admissible. <i>Maple v. Cincinatti, Inc.</i> (1985)</p> <p>24 163 Cal.App.3d 387, 394.</p> <p>25 Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks detail and</p> <p>26 conclusory. Juror No. 2 lacks personal</p> <p>27 knowledge and her statements lack foundation as</p> <p>28 to the reasons and decision making process of the</p> <p>other jurors – after "almost no discussion" –</p> <p>whatever that means, and what they considered or</p> <p>deemed important in reaching their verdict. She</p> <p>does not say which jurors "switched" and she</p> <p>does not say or know why.</p>	<p>□ Sustained</p> <p>☑ Overruled</p> <p><i>in part</i></p> <p>□ Sustained</p> <p>☑ Overruled</p>

15 63

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>“5. Once the <i>discussion of damages began</i>, one of the jurors who favored the plaintiff angrily <i>said</i> that those of us who had favored the defense should not participate in the discussion of damages. A vote was taken regarding whether we should be allowed to participate in the discussion of damages. After the majority of jurors voted that we should not participate, the three of us who had voted for the defense did not participate in the discussion of how to decide on an amount for compensatory damages, or on the amount of damages.”</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150.</p> <p>The statements in paragraph 5 of Juror No. 2’s declaration concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. Such are inadmissible statements pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150 and cannot be used to try to impeach the verdict. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>. “No evidence is admissible to show the effect (of improper influences) upon a juror in influencing him to assent to or dissent from the verdict or concerning the mental processes by which it was determined.” Evid. Code 1150(a) (emphasis added). The rule prevents one or two jurors “from upsetting a verdict of the whole jury by impugning his own or his fellow jurors’ mental process or reasons for assent or dissent.” Wegner, at ¶ 18:288.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>Juror No. 2 Decl., at ¶ 5 (italics added).</p>	<p>Hearsay. Juror No. 2’s statements about what one of jurors (unidentified by name or juror number) supposedly said, discussed or expressed is inadmissible hearsay.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
	<p>Lacks foundation, lacks detail, and conclusory.</p> <p>Juror No. 2 does not have personal knowledge and her vague statements lack foundation regarding the extent of participation of other jurors in discussions in the deliberation process.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

overruled
sustained

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>“6. The jurors who favored the plaintiff <i>said</i> they should increase the amount of damages that they had been <i>discussing</i> because Ms. Echeverria was going to have to pay taxes on the money, pay her lawyers, and pay for an appeal. After the jurors <i>raised</i> those possible costs, other jurors agreed to raise the amount of the damages. The amount that the 9 plaintiff-favoring jurors <i>agreed</i> on for compensatory damages for Ms. Echeverria was based on the net worth of the defendant companies. The jurors <i>decided</i> to award a larger amount of money against the larger company just because they <i>were a bigger company.</i>”</p> <p>Juror No. 2 Decl., at ¶ 6 (italics added).</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150.</p> <p>The statements in paragraph 6 of Juror No. 2’s declaration concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. Such statements are inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150 and cannot be used to try to impeach the verdict. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>; Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, at § 2.27. “Juror declarations that purport to show a deliberative error by one or more jurors are inadmissible to impeach the verdict, as are juror declarations that purport to show . . . [h]ow the jurors arrived at the award of damages.” <i>Id.</i> at § 2.29.</p> <p>Hearsay. Juror No. 2’s statements about what other (unidentified) jurors “said,” were “discussing,” or verbally “raised” or “agreed” regarding their decision-making process in awarding damages is inadmissible hearsay.</p> <p>Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks personal knowledge, conclusory. In paragraph 5, Juror No. 2 said that she and the other “defense jurors” did not participate in the damages discussion. If that was true, it would mean that she has no basis to say why or how other jurors “decided” or “agreed” to assess damages.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><i>in part</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

1765

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>1 "7. When the jury 2 <i>discussed</i> the amount of 3 punitive damages, the jurors 4 who voted in favor of liability 5 did what Allen Smith asked 6 them to do in his closing 7 argument – they set the number 8 based on a percentage of the 9 Defendants' net worth."</p>	<p>Inadmissible pursuant to Evid. Code § 1150. The statements in paragraph 7 concern the mental processes, deliberative thinking, and subjective reasoning of the jury regarding how the verdict was reached. Such statements are inadmissible. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 1150(a); <i>see also</i> § I.A. <i>supra</i>; Statements in "juror declarations that purport to show . . . [h]ow the jurors arrived at the award of damages" are inadmissible. Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, § 2.29. Hearsay. Juror No. 2's statements about what other (unidentified) jurors said or their decision- making process in calculating damages based on what Juror No. 2 heard them say is hearsay. Speculation, lacks foundation, lacks personal knowledge. Juror No. 2 lacks personal knowledge and her statements lack foundation as to what other jurors discussed or how or why they decided or "set" to award damages. Not relevant. Evid. Code § 350. It is not misconduct to consider the defendant's net worth in awarding punitive damages. CACI 3945. <i>See also</i> Cal. Judges Benchbook Civ. Proc. After Trial, Chp. 2, § 2.53 ("[P]unitive damages must be supported by . . . evidence of the defendant's financial condition" and "the defendant's net worth is the critical determinant.").</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

motion to strike: denied 10/6/17

10/20/17

[Signature]

1 I. EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF JUROR NO. 8 (P.C.)

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>2 ¶ 4, lines 10-11: “[E]veryone</p> <p>3 in the jury room was free to</p> <p>4 participate in the damages</p> <p>5 deliberations”</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p>	<p>Vague and ambiguous. The phrase</p> <p>“everyone in the jury room was free to</p> <p>participate in the damages deliberations”</p> <p>appears intended to address the contention</p> <p>in defense jurors’ declarations that they</p> <p>were directed not to deliberate on damages,</p> <p>without actually refuting it. Two sentences</p> <p>later in the juror’s declaration, she professes</p> <p>being unable to remember “whether or not”</p> <p>defense jurors were requested not to</p> <p>participate in damages deliberations. The</p> <p>two contentions—that defense jurors were</p> <p>requested not to deliberate on damages and</p> <p>that they were nonetheless “free to</p> <p>participate in the damages deliberations”—</p> <p>are not necessarily mutually exclusive,</p> <p>where being “free to participate” means</p> <p>something short of having a vote on the</p> <p>final awarded amount. See Evid. Code</p> <p>§§ 352, 765.</p> <p>Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper</p> <p>Statement of Jurors’ Subjective</p> <p>Reasoning/Mental Process). While</p> <p>testimony that specific jurors were told not</p> <p>to participate in damages deliberations, or</p> <p>did or did not in fact participate in them,</p> <p>could be admissible as observable conduct,</p> <p>this juror’s subjective opinion about</p> <p>whether defense-leaning jurors were “free to</p> <p>participate in the damages deliberations” is</p> <p>an improper statement of mental processes</p> <p>to the extent it is based on the juror’s vague</p> <p>feeling or sense of the room, rather than on</p> <p>actual statements made.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p> </p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>16 ¶ 4, lines 12-13: “Everyone</p> <p>17 was given a chance to say</p> <p>18 what they thought about the</p> <p>19 amount to award Ms.</p> <p>20 Echeverria, including the</p> <p>21 jurors who voted for the</p> <p>22 defendants.”</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>	<p>Vague and ambiguous as to the phrase</p> <p>“[e]veryone was given a chance to say what</p> <p>they thought.” That language appears to be</p> <p>a lawerly non-refutation of the contention in</p> <p>defense jurors’ declarations that they were</p> <p>directed not to deliberate on damages.</p> <p>Indeed, the very next sentence of the juror’s</p> <p>declaration states that she cannot remember</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

267

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

	<p>“whether or not” defense jurors were asked not to participate in damages deliberations. The two contentions—that defense jurors were requested not to deliberate on damages and that, notwithstanding, they could have interposed “what they thought about the amount”—are not necessarily mutually exclusive, where having “a chance to say what they thought” means something short of being permitted to vote. See Evid. Code §§ 352, 765.</p> <p>Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper Statement of Jurors’ Subjective Reasoning/Mental Process). While testimony that specific jurors were told not to participate in damages deliberations, or did or did not in fact participate in them, could be admissible as observable conduct, this juror’s subjective opinion about whether “[e]veryone was given a chance to say what they thought” is an improper statement of mental processes to the extent it is based on a vague feeling rather than on actual statements made in the jury room.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>¶ 4, lines 13-15: “I do not remember a request to exclude jurors from these deliberations, but whether or not that happened, everyone on the jury participated in reaching the verdict, and no one was excluded.”</p>	<p>Vague and ambiguous as to the phrase “everyone on the jury participated in reaching the verdict, and no one was excluded.” That artfully worded phrase appears calculated to distinguish between the finding of liability and the damages the jury ultimately awarded. It cannot be true both that there was a “request to exclude jurors from these deliberations” (about which, the juror avers, she cannot remember “whether or not that happened”) and that “everyone on the jury participated in reaching the verdict, and no one was excluded” if “verdict” includes deliberations respecting damages. See Evid. Code §§ 352, 765.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>¶ 5, lines 16-17: “Along with the other jurors, I voted based on the evidence that was presented against each of the defendants and the law that we were instructed to follow.”</p>	<p>Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper Statement of Jurors’ Subjective Reasoning/Mental Process). The statement as to what this juror purports to have subjectively considered in voting is inadmissible both as it concerns her own</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

868


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

	<p>vote and particularly as it concerns the votes of other jurors. The statement goes to the subjective reasoning of the jury in reaching its verdict and is not verifiable and/or based on observable facts/expressions.</p> <p>Conclusory, and lacks foundation and personal knowledge as to the basis for other jurors' votes. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 702.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>¶ 6, lines 22-23: "The evidence presented was considered and was interpreted by me based on my thinking about the evidence."</p>	<p>Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper Statement of Jurors' Subjective Reasoning/Mental Process). The statement as to how this juror purports to have interpreted the evidence and her subjective "thinking" is an example of her subjective reasoning, not verifiable and/or based on observable facts/expressions.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>¶ 6, lines 23-24: "We all worked together and we used our own reasoning skills in a demonstrative manner based on the evidence that was presented in the trial."</p>	<p>Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper Statement of Jurors' Subjective Reasoning/Mental Process). The statement as to how this juror perceives the collective reasoning skills of the jury (and each juror individually, including herself) is not verifiable and/or based on observable facts/expressions.</p> <p>Conclusory, and lacks foundation and personal knowledge as to the basis for the other jurors' deliberations and the manner in which they reached a verdict. <i>See</i> Evid. Code § 702.</p> <p>Vague and ambiguous as to the phrase "demonstrative manner," which appears to have been inserted merely in order to avoid the prohibition of Evidence Code § 1150 on juror declarations concerning "mental processes." <i>See</i> Evid. Code §§ 352, 765.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

469

1 **II. EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF JUROR NO. 10 (N.F.)**

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling:
<p>2 ¶ 3, line 10: "The 3 compensatory damages 4 verdict was a reasonable 5 compromise." 6 7</p>	<p>8 Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper 9 Statement of Jurors' Subjective 10 Reasoning/Mental Process). Whether the 11 juror believes the damages verdict was a 12 "reasonable compromise" is not verifiable 13 and/or based on observable 14 facts/expressions.</p> <p>15 Conclusory and lacks foundation as to 16 whether the verdict was "a reasonable 17 compromise." See Evid. Code § 702.</p>	<p>18 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained 19 <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p>20 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained 21 <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>22 ¶ 3, line 11: "Even though I 23 wanted to award her more, I 24 agreed to the lower amount."</p>	<p>25 Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper 26 Statement of Jurors' Subjective 27 Reasoning/Mental Process). Whether the 28 juror wanted to award any more or less is not verifiable and/or based on observable facts/expressions."</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>¶ 3, lines 20-21: "From my standpoint, I am proud of the fact that all of us were very conscientious in a way that we considered all of the evidence that was presented."</p>	<p>Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper Statement of Jurors' Subjective Reasoning/Mental Process). The juror's statement about what "all of us [the jury]" "considered" goes to her subjective reasoning and is not verifiable and/or based on observable facts/expressions.</p> <p>Conclusory, and lacks foundation and personal knowledge as to whether the other jurors were conscientious or considered all of the evidence. See Evid. Code § 702.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>
<p>¶ 3, lines 22-23: "I believe that the process was fair to both the plaintiff and the defendants."</p>	<p>Evidence Code § 1150 (Improper Statement of Jurors' Subjective Reasoning/Mental Process). The juror's statement of belief as to the fairness of "the process" goes to her subjective beliefs/reasoning and is not verifiable and/or based on observable facts/expressions.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustained <input type="checkbox"/> Overruled</p>

28

 570